

DUE DATE SLIP**GOVT. COLLEGE, LIBRARY**

KOTA (Raj)

Students can retain library books only for two weeks at the most

BORROWER S No	DUE DTATE	SIGNATURE

CHOWKHAMBA SANSKRIT STUDIES, VOL. VIII

1648

THE HISTORY

INDIAN LITERATURE

BY
ALBRECHT WIEGER

VARANASI

CHOWKHAMBA SANSKRIT SERIES OFFICE

PUBLISHER'S NOTE

Among the Western Orientalists, name of Prof Weber occupies a very prominent place. His edition of *Shatpath Brahman*, and contributions in *Indische Studien* & *Indische Streifen*, are still held in the highest esteem both by Western & Indian scholars. But the present work is Prof Weber's crowning contribution to the Indian Literature. It deals very exhaustively, in two parts respectively, the histories of Vedic Literature & the Sanskrit Literature, incorporating therein informations regarding latest researches and newest publications bearing upon the subject. The great erudition and original thinking of Prof Weber has made the treatment of the subject matter very comprehensive, and at the same time, new light has been thrown on many of the disputed faces of our ancient literature.

Such an illuminating and valuable work had long been out of print and not available to the scholars. We, as publishers of Indological books, had been constantly experiencing the great demand of the book and of the resultant frustration due to its nonavailability. Therefore with a view to make it available once again, we decided to reprint it. We are now extremely glad to see our ambition fulfilled.

We earnestly hope that our venture would be welcomed by scholars and lovers of Indian thought, so that we may derive further encouragement to undertake the reprinting of other valuable, yet out of print works.

THE HISTORY

OF

INDIAN LITERATURE

BY

ALBRECHT WEBER

Translated from the Second German Edition

BY

JOHN MANN, M A

AND

THEODOR ZACHARIAE, PH D

With the Sanction of the Author

Nut der, evart—

Auch hier wird es t-gen

POPULAR EDITION

LONDON

KEGAN PAUL, TRENCH, TRUBNER & CO. LTD

BROADWAY HOUSE 63-74 CAPTAN LANE, E.C.

TRANSLATORS' NOTE.

ACCORDING to the original intention, the English translation of this work was to have appeared shortly after the second German edition, which came out in the end of 1875, and which, as mentioned by the author in his preface, was in part prepared with a view to this translation. In consequence, however, of the death of Professor Childers, under whose direction it was in the first instance begun, and of whose aid and supervision it would, had he lived, have had the benefit, the work came to a stand still, and some time elapsed before the task of continuing and completing it was entrusted to those whose names appear on the title-page. The manuscript of the translation thus interrupted embraced a considerable part of the text of the first division of the work (Vedic Literature). It had not undergone any revision by Professor Childers, and was found to be in a somewhat imperfect state, and to require very material modification. Upon Mr Zachariae devolved the labour of correcting it, of completing it as far as the close of the Vedic Period, and of adding the notes to this First Part none of which had been translated. From the number of changes introduced in the course of revision, the portion of the work comprised in the manuscript in question has virtually been re-translated. The rendering of the second division of the volume (Sanskrit Literature) is entirely and exclusively the work of Mr Mann.

The circumstances under which the translation has been

produced have greatly delayed its appearance. But for this delay some compensation is afforded by the Supplementary Notes which Professor Weber has written for incorporation in the volume (p 311 ff), and which supply information regarding the latest researches and the newest publications bearing upon the subjects discussed in the work. Professor Weber has also been good enough to read the sheets as they came from the press, and the translators are indebted to him for a number of suggestions.

A few of the abbreviations made use of in the titles of works which are frequently quoted perhaps require explanation *e.g.*, *I St* for Weber's *Indische Studien*, *I Str* for his *Indische Streifen*, *I AK* for Lassen's *Indische Alterthumskunde*, *Z D M G* for *Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, &c.

The system of transliteration is in the main identical with that followed in the German original, as, however, it varies in a few particulars, it is given here instead of in the Author's Preface. It is as follows —

a	ä	i	ī	u	ū	ṛ	ṛī
ll	ll	o	ai	o	au		
k	kh	g	gh	n			
ch	chh	j	jh	ṣ			
ṭ	ṭh	ḍ	ḍh	n			
t	th	d	dh	n			
p	ph	b	bh	m			
y	r	l	v				
ś	śh	h	h				

Anusvara ṃ in the middle of a word before syllables ṣ, ṣarga ḥ

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION.

THE work of my youth, which here appears in a new edition, had been several years out of print. To have republished it without alteration would scarcely have done, and, owing to the pressure of other labours it was impossible for me, from lack of time, to subject it to a complete and systematic remodelling. So the matter rested. At last, to meet the urgent wish of the publisher, I resolved upon the present edition, which indeed leaves the original text unchanged, but at the same time seeks, by means of the newly added notes, to accommodate itself to the actual position of knowledge. In thus finally deciding, I was influenced by the belief that in no other way, could the great advances made in this field of learning since the first appearance of this work be more clearly exhibited than precisely in this way, and that, consequently, this edition might at the same time serve in some measure to present, *in nuce*, a history of Sanskrit studies during the last four-and-twenty years. Another consideration was, that only by so doing, could I furnish a critically secured basis for the English translation contemplated by Messrs Trubner & Co, which could not possibly now give the original text alone, as was done in the French transla-

tion,* which appeared at Paris in 1859. It was, indeed, while going over the work with the view of preparing it for this English translation, that the hope, nay, the conviction, grew upon me, that, although a complete reconstruction of it was out of the question, still an edition like the present might advantageously appear in a German dress also. I rejoiced to see that this labour of my youth was standing well the test of time. I found in it little that was absolutely erroneous, although much even now remains as uncertain and unsettled as formerly, while, on the other hand, many things already stand clear and sure which I then only doubtfully conjectured, or which were at that time still completely enveloped in obscurity.

The obtaining of critical data from the contents of Indian literature, with a view to the establishment of its internal chronology and history—not the setting forth in detail of the subject-matter of the different works—was, from the beginning, the object I had before me in these lectures, and this object, together with that of specifying the publications which have seen the light in the interval, has continued to be my leading point of view in the present annotation of them. To mark off the new matter, square brackets are used.†

The number of fellow-workers has greatly increased during the last twenty-four years. Instead of here running over their names, I have preferred—in order thus to faci-

* *Histoire de la Littérature Indienne* trad. de Pallmann par Alfred Selous. Paris: A. Durand, 1859.

† In the translation, these brackets are only retained to mark new matter added in the second edition to the original notes of the first; the notes which in the second edition were entirely new are simply indicated by numbers.—Tn.

litate a general view of this part of the subject—to add to the Index, which in other respects also has been considerably enlarged, a new section, showing where I have availed myself of the writings of each, or have at least referred to them. One work there is, however, which, as it underlies all recent labours in this field, and cannot possibly be cited on every occasion when it is made use of, calls for special mention in this place—I mean the Sanskrit Dictionary of Bohtlingk and Roth, which was completed in the course of last summer.* The carrying through of this great work, which we owe to the patronage of the St Petersburg Academy of Sciences, over a period of a quarter of a century, will reflect lasting honour upon that body as well as upon the two editors.

A W

BERLIN, November 1875

* The second edition bears the inscription 'Dedicated to my friends, Bohtlingk and Roth, on the completion of the Sanskrit Dictionary.—Tr.

PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION.

THE lectures herewith presented to the narrow circle of my fellows in this field of study, and also, it is hoped, to the wider circle of those interested in researches into the history of literature generally, are a first attempt, and as such, naturally, defective and capable of being in many respects supplemented and improved. The material they deal with is too vast, and the means of mastering it in general too inaccessible, not to have for a lengthened period completely checked inquiry into its *internal relative* chronology—the only chronology that is possible. Nor could I ever have ventured upon such a labour, had not the Berlin Royal Library had the good fortune to possess the fine collection of Sanskrit MSS formed by Sir R. Chambers, the acquisition of which some ten years ago, through the liberality of his Majesty, Frederick William IV, and by the agency of his Excellency Baron Bunsen, opened up to Sanskrit philology a fresh path, upon which it has already made vigorous progress. In the course of last year, commissioned by the Royal Library, I undertook the work of cataloguing this collection, and as the result a detailed catalogue will appear about simultaneously with these lectures, which may in some sense be regarded as a

commentary upon it. Imperfect as, from the absolute point of view, both works must appear, I yet cherish the hope that they may render good service to learning.

How great my obligations are in the special investigations, to the writings of Colebrooke, Wilson, Lassen, Bur-nouf, Bohtz, Renand, Stenzler, and Holtermann, I only mention here generally, as I have uniformly given ample references to these authorities in the proper place.

The form in which these lectures appear is essentially the same in which they were delivered,* with the exception of a few modifications of style: thus, in particular, the transitions and recapitulations belonging to oral delivery have been either curtailed or omitted, while, on the other hand, to the incidental remarks—here given as foot-notes—much new matter has been added.

A. W.

PRINC, July, 1852.

* In the Winter-Semester of 1851-52.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION,

1-7

Antiquity of Indian literature, 2, proved by geographical evidence, 3-4, by internal evidence from the history of the Hindú religion, 5, by evidence drawn from the language, 6, want of external chronology, 7

FIRST PERIOD—VEDIC LITERATURE.

PRELIMINARY SURVEY,

8-30

(1) *The Samhitás*, 8-11

Samhitás of the three older Vedas, 8-9, mutual relation of the three Vedas, 9-10, period of their final compilation, 10, Samhitá of the Atharvan, 11

(2) *The Bráhmakas*, 11-15

Their character, 12, and origin, 13, mutual relation of the Bráhmakas of the several Vedas, 14, their common name Śruti, 15

(3) *The Sūtras*, &c

Their character and origin, 16, Śrauta Sūtras, 17, Gṛhya- or Smṛti Sūtras, 17, gradual transformation of the original Smṛti (Custom and Law), 17, 18, origin of caste, 18, connection between the Gṛhya-Sūtras and the legal literature, 19-20, linguistic Sūtras, their origin, 20, 21, character of the time in question, 21, 22, Prātiśākhya-Sūtras, 23, metric 23, Anuśāsanā, 24, tradition—Bṛhaddevatā, 24, Nighaṇṭu, Nirukti, the Vedāṅgas, 25, science of grammar, 26, philosophical speculation, 26 ff., names applied to the early ages, 28, Upanishads, Aranyakas, 28, 29, astronomy and medicine, 29, 30.

A —RIGVEDA,

31-62

(a) *Samhitá*, 31-44.

Its divisions, 31, 32, Śákala and Váśiṣṭha recensions.

32, Várkai, the school of the Śunakas, 33, Śaunaka, Pañchāla Bābhravya, 34, mythology of the primitive Indo-Germanic time, 35, Persian and Indian cycles of legend, 36, 37, mode of life of the Indians in their ancient home, 37, 38, reasons why they left their ancient homes, 38, 39, different constituents of Rigveda Samhitā, 39, gods to whom the hymns are addressed, 40, exegetic literature connected with the Samhitā Yāska, 41, Sāyana, 41, 42, editions, translations, &c., 43, 44.

(b) *Brāhmanas*, 44-52

Āitareya and Śāṅkhāyana Brāhmanas, 44; data therein bearing on time of their composition, 45, they presuppose earlier compositions with similar contents, 45-47, fables and legends contained in these two Brāhmanas, 47, the Āraṇyakas of the Rik Āitareya Āraṇyaka, 48 ff., Kauṭīśakāraṇyaka, Kaushītakopaniṣad, 50-51, Samkara's commentaries on the Upaniṣads, 51, Vāśikala Upaniṣad, 52

(c) *Sūtras* 52, 62

The Śrauta Sūtras of Āśvalāyana and Śāṅkhāyana, 52 ff.; commentaries thereon 54, 55, the Gṛhya Sūtras of Āśvalāyana and Śāṅkhāyana, 55 ff., the literature presupposed in these, 56-57, Rik Prātiśākhya, Upalekha, 59, 60, Śikṣā, Chhandas, Jyotiṣa, 60, 61, Anukramanī 61, Pṛhāddevatā, Rigvidhāna, Pariśiṣṭas, 62

B—SĀMAVEDA,

63-85

(a) *Samhitā*, 63-66

Its arrangement, 63, the Gānas, 64, antiquity of the readings of the Sāma Samhitā, 64, 65, recensions, 65, editions, &c., 65, 66

(b) *Brāhmanas*, 66-75

The Tāndya Pañchavinśa-Brāhmaṇa, 66 ff., geographical and other data contained therein, 67-68, Śhaṭṭama Brāhmaṇa, 69, Chhāndogyaopaniṣad, its relation to the Vṛhād Aranyaka, 70, 71, literary and other data in the Chhāndogyaop., 71, 72, Kenopaniṣad, 73, the smaller Brāhmanas of the Sāma—Sāmavidhāna, &c., 74, 75

(c) *Sūtras*, 75-85

Śrauta Sūtras, the Kalpa Sūtra of Mānava, 75-76, Lātyāyana-Sūtra, 76 ff., literature therein presupposed, 76, 77, position of non Brahmanical tribes in this work, 77, existence of Buddhism presupposed, 78, Sūtra of Drāhyāyana, 79, its relation to the Sūtras of the other

Vedas, 80, Anopada Sūtra, 80, 81, Niddāna-Sūtra, 81, 82 the Pūshpa-Sūtra of Gobhila, 82, Sāma Tantra, Pañchar'dhi, Pratihāra, Tanḍilaksana, and Upa-grantha Sūtras, 83, the Gṛīhya-Sūtra of Gobhila, 84 the Karma pradīpa of Kātyāyana, 84, Paddha'tis and Parīśiṣṭas, 85.

C—YAJURVEDA, 85-145

I.—THE BLACK YAJUS, 85-103

(a) Samhitā 85-91

Difference between the Black and the White Yajus, 86, names of the Black Yajus, 86 ff.; Charaka, Taittiriya, and Khādīkiya, 87, 88, schools of the Black Yajus Taittiriya Samhitā (Āpastamba), the Kāthaka, and the Ātreya Śākhā, 88, Samhitās of the Āpastamba and Ātreya schools, and the Kāthaka, 89, data contained therein, 90, Yākas connection with the arrangement of the Samhitā of the Black Yajus, 91, the Mānava and the Maitra, 91

(b) Brāhmanas, 92-99

The Brāhmanas of the Āpastamba and Ātreya schools, the Kāthaka portion of the Taitt Brāhmanas, 92, Taittiriya Āraṇyaka, 93, Upanhads of the Taitt. Ār., 93, 94, schools of the Bhāṭlavins, Śātyāyanina, Śāṅkṣyanina, &c. 95, Śvetāśvataraṇishad, 96, Maitrāyaṇi-Upanishad, its modern date, 97, the plane's, &c., in the Maitr. Up., 98 possible relation of the work to Buddha, 99

(c) Sūtras, 99-103

Śrauta-Sūtras, 99-101, Gṛīhya-Sūtras, 101, 102, Prāti-śākhya Sūtra, 102, Anukramanī, 103

II.—THE WHITE YAJUS, 103-145

The name explained, 103 f., the name 'Vājasaneyi, 104 f., the two schools of the Kānvas and Mādhyandinas, 105, possible connection of the Mādhyandinas with the Mādhyandī, 106.

(a) Samhitā, 107-116

Division of the Vājasaneyi Samhitā, 107, later origin of the last fifteen adhyāyas, 108, relation of the several parts of the Vāj. S. to the Black Yajus 108, to its own Brāhmana, and to each other, 109-110, probable date of the Pudra-book, 110, the mixed caste, 111, position of the Māgadha, 111, its position in the Atharva-Veda, 112, astronomical and other data in the Vāj. S., 113, position of the Kurus and Pañchālas, the names Subhadrā and Kāmpilā, 114, Arjuna and

Phalgunas as (secret) names of Indra, 115, the *ṛcās* incorporated in the Yajus, 115, 116, editions, commentaries, 116

(b) *Brāhmaṇa*, 116-139

The Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, 116, its name and extent, 117, relation of the Brāhmaṇa of the Kātya school to that of the Mādhyamīnas, 117, 118; relation of the several *kāṇḍas* to the Samhitā and to each other, 118, 119, posteriority of the last five *kāṇḍas*, 120, Aguirahasya-kāṇḍa, 120, 121, Aśvāthya-kāṇḍa, 121, subjects of study named therein, 121, 122, other data, 122, 123. Aśvamedha-kāṇḍa, 124 ff., Gāthās, 124, 125, position of Janamejaya, 125, of the Pārikshitas, 126; the Āranyaka-kāṇḍa, 126, the Vṛhad Āranyaka — Madhukāṇḍa, 127, its name and list of teachers, 128, Yājñavalkya-kāṇḍa, 129, Khula-kāṇḍa, 130, the concluding *raśis* of the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, 131, probable north-western origin of *kāṇḍas vi-x* of the Śatap Br, 132 the whole blended together by one arranging hand, 133, teachers mentioned in the Śatap Br, 133, 134, legends, 134 ff., relation of these to the Epic legends, 135, position of the Kuru Pañchālas compared with that of the Pārikshitas, 136, the Pāṇḍavas not mentioned, 137, points of contact with the Sāṃkhya tradition, 137, with Buddhist legend, 138, commentaries on the Śatap Br, editions, &c., 139

(c) *Sūtras*, 139-145

The Śānta-Sūtra of Kātyāyana, teachers mentioned therein, 139, other data, 140, commentaries, 141, Pad dhatīs and Parikṣitas Nigama Parikṣita, Pravara-dhyāya, Charana vyūha, the Vaijāvāpa Sūtra, 142, the Kātya-Gṛhya-Sūtra of Pāraskara, 142, 143, the Prātiśākhya-Sūtra of the Vājasaneyi Samh, 143, 144, Anukramāṇī, 144, 145

D — ATHARVAVEDA, 145-171

(a) *Samhitā*, 145-150

Extent and division of Atharvaveda Samhitā, 145, 146, its contents and arrangement, 146, it probably originated in part with the unbrāhmanised Aryans of the West, 147, data furnished by the Ath. S., the name 'Atharvan,' 148, earliest mention of this name, 149, the name 'Brahmaveda,' its meaning, 149, 150, editions, &c., of the Ath S., 150

(b) *Bṛāhmaṇa*

The Gopāthī Brāhmaṇa, 150-151

(c) *Sūtras*, 151-153

The Sāṅkhya Chaturadhyāyikā, 151, Anukramanī, 152, the Kauśika-Sūtra, 152, Kalpas and Parīśiṣṭas, 153

UPANISHADS, 153-171

Number of the Upanishads, 154, 155, Upanishads belonging to the three older Vedas, 155, 156, special division of the Atharvopaniṣads into three groups—Vedānta, Yoga, and Sektarian Upanishads, 156, Atharvan recension of Upanishads borrowed from the other Vedas, 157 THE ATHARVOPANISHADS PROPER (1) those of the Vedānta class—the Mundakopaniṣad, 158, 159, Prasnopaniṣad, 159, 160, Garbhopaniṣad, 160, Brahmapaniṣad, 160-161, Māndūkyaopaniṣad, 161, remaining Upanishads of the Vedānta class—Prāśnighotrop, Arshikop, 161, 162 (2) Atharvopaniṣads of the Yoga class—Jābala, Kathākruti, Āruṅka Bhāṣavi, and others, 163 range of ideas and style in this class of Upanishads, 165, (3) the Sektarian Upanishads, 165 ff., (a) those in which worship of Viṣṇu (under the names Nārāyaṇa, &c.) is inculcated, 166, Nṛsiṃhatāpani'yopaniṣad, 167, Rāmatāpani'yopaniṣad, 168, Gopālatāpani'yopaniṣad, 169, (β) Upanishads of the Śiva sects—Śatarudriya, Kaivalyopaniṣad, 169, Atharvaśiras, 169, 170, remaining Upanishads of the Śiva sects, 170-171

SECOND PERIOD—SANSKRIT LITERATURE

WHEREIN DISTINGUISHED FROM FIRST PERIOD, . . . 175-183

Distinction in respect of language, 175, gradual development of Indo-Aryan *Bhāṣā*, 176, influence of Indian aborigines thereon, 177, separation of written language from popular dialects—ancient dialectic differences, 178, rock inscriptions in popular dialects, 179, internal evidence for posteriority of second period, 180, critical condition of texts in this period—age of MSS., 181, distinction as regards subject-matter, 182, classification of Sanskrit literature, 183.

A.—WORKS OF POETRY, . . . 183-215

I. EPIC POETRY, 183-196.

(a) *Rāmāyaṇa*, 183-189 forerunners of Epic poetry in Vedic

period, 183, the Mahā Bhārata, 184, existence of a work resembling it in first century A.D., 186, legend of Mahā Bhārata, its relation to Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, &c., 186, text of Mahā-Bhārata, non epic constituents, 187, Kavi translation, Jaimini Bhārata, 189, (δ) *Purāṇas* their general character—ancient *Purāṇas* lost—absence of epic and prominence of ritual element in existing *Purāṇas* and *Upa purāṇas*, 190, 191, (c) *Kāvya*s, 191–196: the Rāmāyaṇa, 191, its allegorical character, 192, colonisation of Southern India, 193; Rāmāyaṇa the work of a single author, 193, different recensions of the text, 194; remaining *Kāvya*s, artificial Epic, 195

2. DRAMATIC POETRY, 196–208

Origin of Drama from dancing, 196, *Nāṭa Sūtras* mentioned in Pāṇini, 197, dancing at the great sacrificial festivals, 198, alleged mention of dramas in oldest (f) Buddhist writings, 199, age of surviving dramas, 200, no foundation for the view which places Kālidāsa in the first century B.C., 201, 202, internal evidence from Kālidāsa's dramas themselves on this point, 203 authenticity of the *Mālavikāgnimitra*, 204, age of Śudraka's *Mṛcchakaṭikā*, 205, subject-matter and special peculiarities of the Hindu drama, 206, possibility of Greek influence on its development, 207.

3 LYRICAL POETRY, 208–210.

Religious lyric, 208, Erotic lyric *Megha dūta*, &c., 209, mystical character of some of these poems—the *Gīta govinda*, 210

4 ETHICO DIDACTIC POETRY, 210–213

Nīti-śāstras, 210, 'Beast Fable', 211, *Pañcha tantra*, *Hita-padāśa*, 212, popular tales and romances, 213

5 HISTORY AND GEOGRAPHY, 213–215

Rāja-tarāṅgiṇī, 213, inscriptions, grants, and coins, 215

B—WORKS OF SCIENCE AND ART, 215–276

1 SCIENCE OF LANGUAGE, 216–232

(a) *Grammar*, 216–225 Pāṇini's Grammar, its peculiar terminology, 216, Pāṇini's date—statements of the Chinese traveller Hsuan Tsang, 217, weakness of the evidence on which Bohtlingk's view rests, 218, existence of Mahābhāṣya in the time of Abhimanyu, 219, acquaintance with Greeks presupposed in Pāṇini, 220, 'Yavandāni' 221, commentaries on Pāṇini—*Paribhāṣā*,

Vārttikas, Mahābhāṣya, 222, date of Kātyāyana, 222, of the Mahābhāṣya, 223, critical condition of the text of Pāṇini, 224, Gana-pāṭha, &c., 225, other grammatical systems, 226. (b) *Lexicography*, 227-230. Amara koṣha, no foundation for the view which places it in the first century B.C., 228, internal evidence against this view, 229, age of the work still uncertain, 230, Dhātu-pāṭha, 230. (c) *Metric, Poetics, Rhetoric*, 231, 232. Cbhandah-śāstra of Piṅgala, Alampkāra-śāstra of Bharata, Sāhitya-darpana, 231.

2 PHILOSOPHY, 232-246

High antiquity of philosophical speculation among the Hindūs, 232, 'Development,' 'Arrangement,' 'Creation' theories of the world, 233, gradual growth of these theories into philosophical systems, 234, the Sāṃkhya system, 235, 236, the Yoga-system, 237, Deis o sects, 238, influence of Sāṃkhya Yoga on development of Gnosticism and Śūfism, 239, the two Mīmāṃsā, 239, Karma Mīmāṃsā Sūtra of Jaimini, 240, Brahma Mīmāṃsā Sūtra of Bādarāyaṇa, 242, age of Bādarāyaṇa, 243, the two logical systems, Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika, 244, Heterodox systems, 246.

3 ASTRONOMY AND AUXILIARY SCIENCES, 246-264.

Antiquity of astronomy, 246, solar year, quinquennial cycle, Yugas, 247, the lunar asterisms, 247, mention of these in Rik Samhitā, 248, Jyotiṣa, 249, the planets, 249, their peculiar Indian names and number, 250, importance of Greek influence here, 251, relations of Greeks with India, 251, the Yavanas, teachers of the ancient Indian astronomers, 252, 'Ptolemaios,' 'Asura Maya,' 253, Romaka Siddhānta, Paulīśa Siddhānta, 253, Greek terms in Varāha Mihira, 254, 255, further development of Indian astronomy. Hindūs the teachers of the Arabs, 255 (also in algebra and arithmetic,—the arithmetical figures, 256), and through the Arabs, of European medieval astronomers, 257, Āryabhaṭa, 257, the five Siddhāntas, 258, Brahmagupta, Varāha Mihira, 259, date of Varāha Mihira, Śatāsana, and Bhāskara, 260, 261. Al-Bīrūnī's statements regarding Bhāskara (?), 262. Later period. Arabs in turn the teachers of the Hindūs in astrology, 263, Arabic technical terms in Indian and European astrological works, 263-264, lore of omens and portents, 264, magic, &c., 264.

4. MEDICAL SCIENCE, 265-271

Its earliest representatives, 265, Charaka, Śaṅguta, Dhanvantari, 266, Śiṅghotra, Vātsyāyana, 267, uncertain date of extant medical works, 268, Hindū medicine apparently an independent development, 269, questionable authenticity of existing texts, 269, importance of Indian medicine, 269, its influence on Arabs, 270

5. ART OF WAR, MUSIC, FORMATIVE AND TECHNICAL ARTS, 271-276

Art of war (Dhanur veda) · Viśvāmitra, Bharadvāja, 271, music (Gāndharva veda), 271 (musical notation, 272), Artha Śāstra, 273 painting and sculpture, 273, architecture, 274, technical arts, 275

C—WORKS ON LAW, CUSTOM, AND RELIGIOUS WORSHIP, 276-283

The Dharma-Śāstras, 276, Code of Manu, Brahmanical organisation as here presented, 276, highly developed judicial procedure here exhibited, 277, connection of Dharma Śāstras with Grhya Śāstras, 277, 278, critical questions connected with existing text of Manu, 279, different redactions of Manu and the other Dharma Śāstras, number of these 280, relation of Manu's Code to that of Yājñavalkya, date of the latter, 280, 281; Epics poetry and Purāṇas also sources for Hindū law, 282; modern jurisprudence, 282, Dekhan the chief seat of literary activity after eleventh century, 283.

P—BUDDHISTIC SANSKRIT LITERATURE, 283-310

Buddham, its origin from Śāṅkhya doctrine, 284, relation of Buddhist legend to the later portions of Vedic literature, 285, princes of same name in Buddhist legend and Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa, 286, position in former of Kuru Pañchāṅgas, Pāṇḍavas, Māgadhas 286, 287, Buddhist eras, 287, discordance of these with other historical evidence, 287, earliest demonstrable use of these eras, 288, Buddha's doctrine, 288, his novel way of promulgating it, and opposition to Brahmanical hierarchy, 289, tradition as to redaction of Buddhistic sacred scriptures, Northern and Southern, 290, mutual relation of the two collections, 292 Pāli historical literature, 293, scriptures of Northern Buddhists their gradual origin, 294, language in which Southern scriptures were at first preserved different from that in which the Northern scriptures were recorded at third

council, 295, 296 (Jaina literature, 295), data furnished by Buddhist Sanskrit literature of doubtful authority for Buddha's age, 297

- (a) The *Sūtra-Piśāka* distinction between the simple and the *Mahāraupulya-Sūtras*, 298, poetical pieces in Liter. Gāthā dialect, 299, contents of the simple Sūtras: Ityukta, Vyākaraṇa, Avadāna, Adbhuta dharma, Geṣa, Gāthā, Upadeśa, Nidāna, Jātaka, 300, 301, their Pantheon different from that of the Brāhmaṇa texts, 301, but identical with that of the Epic poetry, 303; other chronological data in the Sūtras, 304.—(b) The *Vijaya-Piśāka* doctrine of clergy, system of mendicancy, 305, Buddhist hierarchy as distinguished from the Brahmanical, Buddhist cult, 305, points of connection with Christianity, 307.—(c) The *Alakāra-Piśāka*, 307, schools of Buddhist philosophy, 303, relation to the Sāṃkhya-system, 303, and to Gāṇḍhīya, 309.—Comments on the sacred scriptures, 309, Tantras, 30

SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES,	311
--------------------------------	-----

INDICES

SANDESKA DEVI	3-9
INDEX OF MATTERS, &c.,	353
INDEX OF AUTHORS,	358

LECTURES

ON THE

HISTORY OF INDIAN LITERATURE

At the very outset of these lectures I find myself in a certain degree of perplexity, being rather at a loss how best to entitle them. I cannot say that they are to treat of the history of "Indian Literature," for then I should have to consider the whole body of Indian languages, including those of non-Aryan origin. Nor can I say that their subject is the history of "Indo-Aryan Literature," for then I should have to discuss the modern languages of India also, which form a third period in the development of Indo-Aryan speech. Nor, lastly, can I say that they are to present a history of "Sanskrit Literature," for the Indo-Aryan language is not in its first period "Sanskrit," i.e., the language of the educated, but is still a popular dialect, while in its second period the people spoke not Sanskrit, but Prakritic dialects, which arose simultaneously with Sanskrit out of the ancient Indo-Aryan vernacular. In order, however, to relieve you from any doubt as to what you have to expect from me here, I may at once remark that it is only the literature of the first and second periods of the Indo-Aryan language with which we have to do. For the sake of brevity I retain the name "Indian Literature."

I shall frequently in the course of these lectures be forced to draw upon your forbearance. The subject they discuss may be compared to a yet uncultivated tract of

country, of which only a few spots have here and there been cleared, while the greater part of it remains covered with dense forest, impenetrable to the eye, and obstructing the prospect. A clearance is indeed now by degrees being made, but slowly, more especially because in addition to the natural obstacles which impede investigation, there still prevails a dense mist of prejudice and preconceived opinions hovering over the land, and enfolding it as with a veil.

The literature of India passes generally for the most ancient literature of which we possess written records, and justly so¹. But the reasons which have hitherto been thought sufficient to establish this fact are not the correct ones, and it is indeed a matter for wonder that people should have been so long contented with them. In the first place, Indian tradition itself has been adduced in support of this fact, and for a very long time this was considered sufficient. It is, I think, needless for me to waste words upon the futile nature of such evidence. In the next place, astronomical data have been appealed to, according to which the Vedas would date from about 1400 B.C. But these data are given in writings, which are evidently of very modern origin, and they might consequently be the result of calculations² instituted for the express purpose. Fur-

¹ In so far as this claim may not now be disputed by the Egyptian monumental records and papyrus rolls or even by the Assyrian literature which has but recently been brought to light.

² Besides, these calculations are of a very vague character and do not yield any such definite date as that given above, but only some epoch lying between 1820-360 B.C., see *J. St.*, x. 236. Whitney in *Journ. R. A. S.*, i. 317, ff. (1864). True the circumstance that the oldest records begin the series of *nakshatras* with the sign *Kṛttikā*, carries us back to a considerably earlier period even than these dates, derived from the so-called Vedic Calendar, viz., to a period between 2780-1820 B.C. since the vernal equinox coincided with γ Tauri (*Kṛttikā*), in round numbers, about the year 2300 B.C., see *J. St.*, x. 234, 236. But, on the

other hand, the opinion expressed in the first edition of this work (1852) to the effect that the Indians may either have brought the knowledge of these lunar mansions headed by *Kṛttikā*, with them into India, or else have obtained it at a later period through the commercial relations of the Phœnicians with the Persians, has recently gained considerably in probability, and therewith the suggestion of Babylon as the mother country of the observations on which this date is established. See the second of my two treatises, *Die vedischen Nachrichten von den Nakshatra* (Berlin, 1862) pp. 4362-400, my paper, *Ueber den Vedakalender Namens Jyotisha* (1862), p. 15. *J. St.*, x. 429 ix. 241 ff. Whitney *Oriental and Linguistic Studies* (1874) ii. 418 — indeed a direct reference to Babylon and its sea trade, in which the exportation of peacocks is mentioned, has lately come to light

ther, one of the Buddhist eras has been relied upon, according to which a reformer is supposed to have arisen in the sixth century B C, in opposition to the Brahmanical hierarchy, but the authenticity of this particular era is still extremely questionable. Lastly, the period when Panini, the first systematic grammarian, flourished, has been referred to the fourth century B C, and from this, as a starting-point, conclusions as to the period of literary development which preceded him have been deduced. But the arguments in favour of Panini's having lived at that time³ are altogether weak and hypothetical, and in no case can they furnish us with any sort of solid basis.

The reasons, however, by which we are fully justified in regarding the literature of India as the most ancient literature of which written records on an extensive scale have been handed down to us, are these —

In the more ancient parts of the *Rigveda-Samhita*, we find the Indian race settled on the north-western borders of India, in the Panjab, and even beyond the Panjab, on the Kubha, or *Κωφῆν*, in Kabul.⁴ The gradual spread of

in an Indian text, the *Bāverujātaka*, see Minayeff in the *Mélanges Asiatiques* (Imperial Russian Academy), vi. 577 ff (1871), and *Monatsberichte* of the Berlin Academy p 622 (1871). As, however, this testimony belongs to a comparatively late period, no great importance can be attached to it — Direct evidence of ancient commercial relations between India and the West has recently been found in hieroglyphic texts of the seventeenth century at which time the Aryas would appear to have been already settled on the India. For the word *kaps*, 'ape' which occurs in 1 Kings x 22, in the form *qōf*, Gr *αἴψος* is found in these Egyptian texts in the form *kafu* see Joh. Dumichen, *Die Flotte eines ägypt. Königin aus dem 17. Jahrh* (Leipzig, 1868) table II p 17. Lastly, *tskhim* the Hebrew name for peacocks (1 Kings x. 22, 2 Chron. ix. 21) necessarily implies that already in Solomon's time the Phœnician opium merchants "ont eu affaire soit au pays même des Abhira soit sur un autre point de la côte de

l'Inde avec des peuplades dravidiennes," Julien Vinson, *Revue de Linguistique*, vi. 120 ff (1873). See also Burnell, *Elements of South Indian Palæography*, p 5 (Mangalore 1874).

³ Or even, as Goldstucker supposes, earlier than Buddha.

⁴ One of the Vedic Rishis, asserted to be Vatsa, of the family of Kaarya, extols, *Rik*, viii 6. 46-48, the splendid presents, consisting of horses, cattle, and *ushtras* yoked four together — (Roth in the *St. Petersburg Diet.* explains *ushtra* as 'buffalo, humped bull' generally it means 'camel') — which, to the glory of the Yâdvas, he received whilst residing with Tirupdîra and Parâu. Or have we here only a single person, Tirupdîra Parâu? In the *Śâukhâyana Śrauta Sutra*, xvi. 11 20, at least, he is understood as Tirupdîra Parâu savya. These names suggest Tiruvidates and the Peruvians, see *J. St.*, iv 379 n but compare Girard de Rialle, *Revue de Linguist.*, iv 227 (1872). Of course, we must not think of the

the race from these seats towards the east, beyond the Sarasvatī and over Hindustan as far as the Ganges can be traced in the later portions of the Vedic writings almost step by step. The writings of the following period, that of the epic, consist of accounts of the internal conflicts among the conquerors of Hindustan themselves as, for instance, the *Maha-Bharata*, or of the farther spread of Brahmanism towards the south, as, for instance, the *Ramayana*. If we connect with this the first fairly accurate information about India which we have from a Greek source, viz, from Megasthenes,* it becomes clear that at the time of this writer the Brahmanising of Hindustan was already completed, while at the time of the Ptolemy (see Lassen, *IAK*, II. 150, n., *IS*, II. 192) the very southernmost point of the Dekhan had already become a seat of the worship of the wife of Śiva. What a series of years, of centuries, must necessarily have elapsed before this boundless tract of country, inhabited by wild and vigorous tribes, could have been brought over to Brahmanism! It may perhaps here be objected that the races and tribes found by Alexander on the banks of the Indus appear to stand entirely on a Vedic, and not on a Brahmanical footing. As a matter of fact this is true, but we should not be justified in drawing from this any conclusion whatever with regard to India itself. For these peoples of the Panjab never submitted to the Brahmanical order of things, but always retained their ancient Vedic standpoint, free and independent, without either priestly domination or system of caste. For this reason, too, they were the objects of a cordial hatred on the part of their kinsmen, who had wandered farther on, and on this account also Buddhism gained an easy entrance among them.

Persians after Cyrus that would bring us too far down. But the Persians were so called and had their own princes even before the time of Cyrus. Or ought we rather, as suggested by Olabausen in the *Berliner Monatsberichte* (1874), p. 708, to think of the Parthavas, i.e., Parthians who as well as Pārsas are mentioned in the time of the Achæmenids? The derivation, hitherto

current, of the word *Tyrin* *Tiridates*, &c., from the Pahlavi *tr̥*=*Zend* *tištrya* (given *eg.* by M. Bréal, *De Persici nominibus* (1863), pp. 9-10), is hardly justified.

* Who as ambassador of Seleucus resided for some time at the court of Chandragupta. His reports are preserved to us chiefly in the *Indica* of Arrian, who lived in the second century A.D.

And while the claims of the written records of Indian literature to a high antiquity—its beginnings may perhaps be traced back even to the time when the Indo Aryans still dwelt together with the Persa-Aryans—are thus indisputably proved by external, geographical testimony, the internal evidence in the same direction which may be gathered from their contents, is no less conclusive. In the songs of the Rik, the robust spirit of the people gives expression to the feeling of its relation to nature with a spontaneous freshness and simplicity, the powers of nature are worshipped as superior beings, and their kindly aid besought within their several spheres. Beginning with this nature-worship, which everywhere recognises only the individual phenomena of nature, and these in the first instance as superhuman, we trace in Indian literature the progress of the Hindú people through almost all the phases of religious development through which the human mind generally has passed. The individual phenomena of nature, which at first impress the imagination as being superhuman, are gradually classified within their different spheres, and a certain unity is discovered among them. Thus we arrive at a number of divine beings, each exercising supreme sway within its particular province whose influence is in course of time further extended to the corresponding events of human life, while at the same time they are endowed with human attributes and organs. The number—already considerable—of these natural deities, these regents of the powers of nature, is further increased by the addition of abstractions, taken from ethical relations, and to these as to the other deities divine powers, personal existence, and activity are ascribed. Into this multitude of divine figures, the spirit of inquiry seeks at a later stage to introduce order, by classifying and co-ordinating them according to their principal bearings. The principle followed in this distribution is, like the conception of the deities themselves, entirely borrowed from the contemplation of nature. We have the gods who act in the heavens, in the air, upon the earth, and of these the sun, the wind, and fire are recognised as the main representatives and rulers respectively. These three gradually obtain precedence over all the other gods, who are only looked upon as their creatures and servants. Strength

ened by these classifications, speculation presses on and seeks to establish the relative position of these three deities, and to arrive at unity for the supreme Being. This is accomplished either speculatively, by actually assuming such a supreme and purely absolute Being, viz., "Brahman" (neut.), to whom these three in their turn stand in the relation of creatures, of servants only, or arbitrarily, according as one or other of the three is worshipped as the supreme god. The sun-god seems in the first instance to have been promoted to this honour, the Persa-Aryans at all events retained this standpoint, of course extending it still further, and in the older parts of the Brahmanas also—to which rather than to the Samhitās the Avesta is related in respect of age and contents—we find the sun-god here and there exalted far above the other deities (*prasavitā devānām*). We also find ample traces of this in the forms of worship, which so often preserve relics of antiquity.⁵ Nay, as "Brahman" (masc.), he has in theory retained this position, down even to the latest times, although in a very colourless manner. His colleagues, the air and fire gods, in consequence of their much more direct and sensible influence, by degrees obtained complete possession of the supreme power, though constantly in conflict with each other. Their worship has passed through a long series of different phases, and it is evidently the same which Megasthenes found in Hindustan,* and which at the time of the Periplus had penetrated, though in a form already very corrupt, as far as the southernmost point of the Dekhan.

But while we are thus justified in assuming a high antiquity for Indian literature, on external geographical grounds, as well as on internal evidence, connected with the history of the Hindú religion,⁶ the case is sufficiently unsatisfactory, when we come to look for definite chrono-

⁵ Cf. my paper, *Zwei vedische Texte über Omina und Portenta* (1859), pp. 392-393.

⁶ To these, thirdly, we have to add evidence derived from the language. The edicts of Piyadasi, whose date is fixed by the mention therein of Greek kings, and even of Alexander himself, are written in

popular dialects, for whose gradual development out of the language of the Vedic hymns into this form it is absolutely necessary to postulate the lapse of a series of centuries.

* According to Strabo, p. 117, *Asorvoros* (Rudra Soma, Siva) was worshipped in the mountains, *Ἰνδρῆς* (Indra, Vishnu) in the plain.

logical dates We must reconcile ourselves to the fact that any such search will, as a general rule, be absolutely fruitless It is only in the case of those branches of literature which also became known abroad, and also in regard to the last few centuries, when either the dates of manuscripts, or the data given in the introductions or closing observations of the works themselves, furnish us some guidance, that we can expect any result. Apart from this, an internal chronology based on the character of the works themselves, and on the quotations, &c, therein contained, is the only one possible

Indian literature divides itself into two great periods, the Vedic and the Sanskrit Turning now to the former, or Vedic period, I proceed to give a preliminary general outline of it before entering into the details

FIRST PERIOD

VEDIC LITERATURE.

WE have to distinguish four Vedas—the Rig-Veda, the Sama-Veda, the Yajur-Veda, which is in a double form, and the Atharva-Veda. Each of these is again subdivided into three distinct parts—Samhitā, Brāhmaṇa, and Sūtra.

Their relation to each other is as follows —

The Samhitā* of the Rik is purely a lyrical collection, comprising the store of song which the Hindús brought with them from their ancient homes on the banks of the Indus, and which they had there used for “invoking prosperity on themselves and their flocks, in their adoration of the dawn, in celebration of the struggle between the god who wields the lightning and the power of darkness, and in rendering thanks to the heavenly beings for preservation in battle”† The songs are here classified, according to the families of poets to which they are ascribed. The principle of classification is consequently, so to speak, a purely scientific one. It is therefore possible, though more cannot be said, that the redaction of the text may be of later date than that of the two Samhitās which

* The name Samhitā (collection) first occurs in the so-called Aran yakas, or latest supplements to the Brāhmaṇas, and in the Sūtras, but whether in the above meaning, is not as yet certain. The names by which the Samhitās are designated in the Brāhmaṇas are—*ether śikāśā, śikāśā, yajurśikāśā*,—or *Rigveda, Śāma-veda, Yajur-veda*,—or *Brahmāṇas, Chhandogā, Adhvaryu*,—or *trayī*

vidyā, viddhyā, adhyayana, also ‘Veda’ alone. It is in the Sūtras that we first find the term Chhandas specially applied to the Samhitās, and more particularly in Pāṇini, by whom Rishi, Nigama, Mantra (3) are also employed in the same manner.

† See Roth, *Zur Literatur und Geschichte der Wale*, p. 8 (Stuttgart, 1846).

will come next under our consideration, and which, providing as they do for a practical want, became necessary immediately upon the institution of a worship with a fixed ritual. For the Samhitá of the Sáman, and both the Samhitas of the Yajus, consist only of such *richas* (verses) and sacrificial formulas as had to be recited at the ceremonies of the Soma offering and other sacrifices, and in the same order in which they were practically used, at least, we know for certain, that this is the case in the Yajus. The Samhitá of the Sáman contains nothing but verses (*richas*), those of the Yajus, sentences in prose also. The former, the *richas*, all recur, with a few exceptions, in the Rik-Samhita, so that the Sama-Samhita is nothing more than an extract from the songs of the latter, of the verses applied to the Soma offering. Now the *richas* found in the Sáma-Samhitá and Yajus-Samhita appear in part in a very altered form, deviating considerably from the text of the Rik, the Rik-Samhita. Of this a triple explanation is possible. First, these readings may be earlier and more original than those of the Rik, liturgical use having protected them from alteration, while the simple song, not being immediately connected with the sacred rite, was less scrupulously preserved. Or, secondly, they may be later than those of the Rik, and may have arisen from the necessity of precisely adapting the text to the meaning attributed to the verse in its application to the ceremony. Or, lastly, they may be of equal authority with those of the Rik, the discrepancies being merely occasioned by the variety of districts and families in which they were used, the text being most authentic in the district and family in which it originated, and less so in those to which it subsequently passed. All three methods of explanation are alike correct, and in each particular case they must all be kept in view. But if we look more closely at the relation of these verses, it may be stated thus. The *richas* occurring in the Sama-Samhita generally stamp themselves as older and more original by the greater antiquity of their grammatical forms, those in the two Samhitas of the Yajus, on the contrary, generally give the impression of having undergone a secondary alteration. Instances which come under the third method of explanation are found in equal

numbers, both in the Sāma-Samhitā and the Yajuh-Samhitā. Altogether, too much stress cannot be laid on this point, namely, that the alterations which the songs and hymns underwent in the popular mouth during their oral transmission, must in any case be regarded as very considerable, since preservation by means of writing is not to be thought of for this period. Indeed we can hardly admit it for the time of the Brahmanas either, otherwise it would be difficult to account for the numerous deviations of the various schools with regard to the text of these works also, as well as for the great number of different schools (Śākhās) generally.

But although the songs of the Rik, or the majority of them, were composed on the banks of the Indus, their final compilation and arrangement can only have taken place in India proper, at what time, however, it is difficult to say. Some portions come down to an age so recent, that the system of caste had already been organised, and tradition itself, in ascribing to Śakalya and Pañchāla Bābhavya a leading part in the arrangement of the Rik-Samhitā, points us to the flourishing epoch of the Videhas and Pañchālas, as I shall show hereafter. The Samhitā of the Saman, being entirely borrowed from the Rik, gives no clue to the period of its origin, only, in the fact that it contains no extracts from any of the later portions of the Rik, we have perhaps an indication that these were not then in existence. This, however, is a point not yet investigated. As for the two Samhitās of the Yajus, we have in the prose portions peculiar to them, most distinct proofs that both originated in the eastern parts of Hindustān,⁷ in the country of the Kurupañchalas, and that they belong to a period when the Brahmanical element had already gained the supremacy, although it had still to encounter many a hard struggle, and when at all events the hierarchy of the Brahmans, and the system of caste, were completely organised. Nay, it may be that we have even external grounds for supposing that the present redaction of the Samhitā of the White Yajus dates from the third century B.C. For Megasthenes mentions a people called *Μαδιανδῖνοι*, and this name recurs in the *Μα-*

⁷ Or rather to the east of the Indus, in Hindustān.

dhyamdinas, the principal school of the White Yajus More of this later on

The origin of the Atharva-Samhita dates also from the period when Brahmanism had become dominant. It is in other respects perfectly analogous to the Rik-Samhita, and contains the store of song of this Brahmanical epoch. Many of these songs are to be found also in the last, that is, the least ancient book of the Rik-Samhita. In the latter they are the latest additions made at the time of its compilation, in the Atharvan they are the proper and natural utterance of the present. The spirit of the two collections is indeed entirely different. In the Rik there breathes a lively natural feeling a warm love for nature, while in the Atharvan there prevails, on the contrary, only an anxious dread of her evil spirits, and their magical powers. In the Rik we find the people in a state of free activity and independence, in the Atharvan we see it bound in the fetters of the hierarchy and of superstition. But the Atharva-Samhita likewise contains pieces of great antiquity, which may perhaps have belonged more to the people proper, to its lower grades, whereas the songs of the Rik appear rather to have been the especial property of the higher families*. It was not without a long struggle that the songs of the Atharvan were permitted to take their place as a fourth Veda. There is no mention made of them in the more ancient portions of the Brahmanas of the Rik, Sāman, and Yajus, indeed they only originated simultaneously with these Brahmanas, and are therefore only alluded to in their later portions.

We now come to the second part of Vedic literature, the Brāhmanas

The character of the Brāhmanas† may be thus gene-

* This surmise, based upon certain passages in the Atharvan, would certainly be at variance with the name 'Atharvāṅgirasas, borne by this Samhita, according to which it would belong on the contrary to the most ancient and noble Brahman families. But I have elsewhere advanced the conjecture, that this name was simply assumed in order to impart a greater sanctity to the contents, see I. St., 2. 295 [Zwei

vedische Texte über Omina und Portenta pp 346-348]

† This term signifies that which relates to prayer, *brahman*. *Brahman* itself means 'drawing forth, as well in a physical sense 'producing' 'creating, as in a spiritual one 'lifting up' 'elevating' 'strengthening'. The first mention of the name Brāhmana, in the above sense, is to be met in the Brāhmana of the White Yajus, and especially in its third

rally defined. Their object is to connect the sacrificial songs and formulas with the sacrificial rite, by pointing out, on the one hand, their direct mutual relation, and, on the other, their symbolical connection with each other. In setting forth the former, they give the particular ritual in its details; in illustrating the latter, they are either directly explanatory and analytic, dividing each formula into its constituent parts, or else they establish that connection dogmatically by the aid of tradition or speculation. We thus find in them the oldest rituals we have, the oldest linguistic explanations, the oldest traditional narratives, and the oldest philosophical speculations. This peculiar character is common generally to all works of this class, yet they differ widely in details, according to their individual tendency, and according as they belong to this or that particular Veda. With respect to age they all date from the period of the transition from Vedic civilisation and culture to the Brahmanic mode of thought and social order. Nay, they help to bring about this very transition, and some of them belong rather to the time of its commencement, others rather to that of its termination.* The Brahmanas originated from the opinions of individual sages, imparted by oral tradition, and preserved as well as supplemented in their families and by their disciples. The more numerous these separate traditions became, the more urgent became the necessity for bringing them into harmony with each other. To this end, as time went on, compilations, comprising a variety of these materials, and in which the different opinions on each subject were uniformly traced to their original represen-

teenth book. In cases where the dogmatical explanation of a ceremonial or other precept has already been given, we there find the expression *tasyakto brāhmaṇam*, 'of this the Brāhmaṇa has already been stated,' whereas in the books preceding the thirteenth, we find in such cases *tasyakto bandhuh* 'its connection has already been set forth' [*I St.*, v 60, ix 35]—Besides Brāhmaṇa, Pravaçana is also used in the Sāma Sūtras, according to the

commentary, in the same sense, they also mention Anubrāhmaṇa, a term which does not occur elsewhere except in Pāṇini.

* Pāṇini, iv 3 105, directly mentions 'older (*pūrnāpūrva*) Brāhmaṇas', and in contradistinction to these there must, of course, have been in existence in his day 'more modern (or as the scholast says, *atyaḥita*) Brāhmaṇas' [See on this Goldstucker, *Pāṇini*, p 132, ff, and my rejoinder in *I St.*, v 64 ff]

tatives, were made in different districts by individuals peculiarly qualified for the task. But whether these compilations or digests were now actually written down, or were still transmitted orally only, remains uncertain. The latter supposition would seem probable from the fact that of the same work we here and there find two texts entirely differing in their details. Nothing definite, however, can be said on the subject, for in these cases there may possibly have been some fundamental difference in the original, or even a fresh treatment of the materials. It was, moreover, but natural that these compilers should frequently come into collision and conflict with each other. Hence we have now and then to remark the exhibition of strong animosity against those who in the author's opinion are heterodox. The preponderant influence gradually gained by some of these works over the rest—whether by reason of their intrinsic value, or of the fact that their author appealed more to the hierarchal spirit*—has resulted, unfortunately for us, in the preservation of these only, while works representative of the disputed opinions have for the most part disappeared. Here and there perhaps in India some fragments may still be found, in general, however, here as everywhere in Indian literature, we encounter the lamentable fact that the works which, in the end, came off victorious, have almost entirely supplanted and effaced their predecessors. After all, a comparatively large number of Brahmanas is still extant—a circumstance which is evidently owing to their being each annexed to a particular Veda, as well as to the fact that a sort of petty jealousy had always prevailed among the families in which the study of the different Vedas was hereditarily transmitted. Thus in the case of each Veda, such works at least as had come to be considered of the highest authority have been preserved, although the practical significance of the Brahmanas was

* The difficulty of their preservation is also an important factor in the case, as at that time writing either did not exist at all, or at any rate was but seldom employed. ["In considering the question of the age and extent of the use of

writing in India, it is important to point out that the want of suitable materials, in the North at least, before the introduction of paper, must have been a great obstacle to its general use. —Burnell, *Elements of Sanskrit & Indian Palæography*, p. 10.]

gradually more and more lost, and passed over to the Sūtras, &c. To the number of the Brahmanas, or recensions of the Samhitas, which were thus lost, belong those of the Vāshkalas, Parāṅgins, Bhallavins, Śātyayanins, Kalabayins, Lamakayanins, Sambuvins, Khadayanins, and Śālaṅkāyanins, which we find quoted on various occasions in writings of this class, besides all the Chhandas works (Samhitas) specified in the *gana* 'Śaunaka' (Pan, iv 3 106), whose names are not so much as mentioned elsewhere.

The difference between the Brāhmanas of the several Vedas as to subject-matter is essentially this. The Brahmanas of the Rik, in their exposition of the ritual, generally specify those duties only which fell to the Hotar, or reciter of the *richas*, whose office it was to collect from the various hymns the verses suited to each particular occasion, as its *śastra* (canon). The Brāhmanas of the Saman confine themselves to the duties of the Udgatar, or singer of the *sāmans*, the Brahmanas of the Yajus, to the duties of the Adhvaryu, or actual performer of the sacrifice. In the Brahmanas of the Rik, the order of the sacrificial performance is on the whole preserved, whereas the sequence of the hymns as they occur in the Rik-Samhita is not attended to at all. But in the Brāhmanas of the Saman and Yajus, we find a difference corresponding to the fact that their Samhitas are already adapted to the proper order of the ritual. The Brahmana of the Śālaṅ enters but seldom into the explanation of individual verses, the Brahmana of the White Yajus, on the contrary, may be almost considered as a running dogmatic commentary on its Samhita, to the order of which it adheres so strictly, that in the case of its omitting one or more verses, we might perhaps be justified in concluding that they did not then form part of the Samhita. A supplement also has been added to this Brahmana for some of those books of the Samhita which were incorporated with it at a period subsequent to its original compilation, so that the Brahmana comprises 100 *adhyāyas* instead of 60, as formerly seems to have been the case. The Brāhmana of the Black Yajus does not, as we shall see further on, differ in its contents, but only in point of time, from its Samhita. It is, in fact, a supplement to it. The Brāhmana of the

Atharvan is up to the present time unknown, though there are manuscripts of it in England.*

The common name for the Brahmana literature is *Śruti*, 'hearing,' i.e., that which is subject of hearing, subject of exposition, of teaching, by which name their learned, and consequently exclusive, character is sufficiently intimated. In accordance with this we find in the works themselves frequent warnings against intrusting the knowledge contained in them to any profane person. The name *Śruti* is not indeed mentioned in them, but only in the *Sūtras*, though it is perfectly justified by the corresponding use of the verb *śru* which occurs in them frequently.

The third stage in Vedic literature is represented by the *Sūtras**. These are, upon the whole, essentially founded

* It has since been published, see below. It presents no sort of direct internal relation to the *Ath. Samhitā*.

* The word *Sūtra* in the above sense occurs first in the *Madhukāṇḍa*, one of the latest supplements to the *Brahmana* of the White *Yajus*, next in the two *Grihya Sūtras* of the *Rik*, and finally in *Pāṇini*. It means 'thread,' 'band,' of Lat. *suer*. Would it be correct to regard it as an expression analogous to the German *band* (volume)? If so, the term would have to be understood of the fastening together of the leaves and would necessarily presuppose the existence of writing (in the same way, perhaps as *grantha* does, a term first occurring in *Pāṇini*!) Inquiry into the origin of Indian writing has not, unfortunately, led to much result as yet. The oldest inscriptions, according to Wilson, date no earlier than the third century B.C. Nearchus however, as is well known, mentions writing, and his time corresponds very well upon the whole to the period to which we must refer the origin of the *Sūtras*. But as these were composed chiefly with a view to their being committed to memory—a fact which follows from their form, and partly accounts for it—there might be good grounds

for taking exception to the etymology just proposed, and for regarding the signification 'guiding line,' 'clue' as the original one. (This is the meaning given in the *St. Petersburg Dictionary*—The writing of the Indians is of Semitic origin, see Benfey *Indien* (in *Ersch and Gruber's Encyclopædia* 1840), p. 254; my *Indische Studien* (1856), p. 127 ff. Burnell, *Elem. of South Indian Pal.*, p. 3 ff. Probably it served in the first instance merely for secular purposes, and was only applied subsequently to literature. See Müller *Anc. S. Lat.*, p. 507, *I St.*, v. 20 ff., *I Str.*, n. 339. Goldstucker (*Pāṇini*, 1860 p. 26, ff.) contends that the words *sūtra* and *grantha* must absolutely be connected with writing. See, however *I St.*, v. 24, ff., xii. 476.]—Nor does etymology lead us to a more certain result in the case of another word found in this connection, viz., *akṣara*, syllable. This word does not seem to occur in this sense in the *Samhitā* of the *Rik* (or *Sāman*), it there rather signifies 'imperishable.' The connecting link between this primary signification and the meaning syllable which is first met with in the *Samhitā* of the *Yajus*, might perhaps be the idea of writing, the latter being the making imperishable, as it were, of otherwi-

on the Brahmanas, and must be considered as their necessary supplement, as a further advance in the path struck out by the latter in the direction of more rigid system and formalism⁹. While the Brahmanas, with the view of explaining the sacrifice and supporting it by authority, &c., uniformly confine themselves to individual instances of ritual, interpretation, tradition, and speculation, subjecting these to copious dogmatic treatment, the object of the Sūtras is to comprehend everything that had any reference whatever to these subjects. The mass of matter became too great, there was risk of the tenor of the whole being lost in the details, and it gradually became impossible to discuss all the different particulars consecutively. Diffuse discussion of the details had to be replaced by concise collective summaries of them. The utmost brevity was, however, requisite in condensing this great mass, in order to avoid overburdening the memory, and this brevity ultimately led to a remarkably compressed and enigmatical style, which was more and more cultivated as the literature of the Sūtras became more independent, and in proportion as the resulting advantages became apparent. Thus the more ancient a Sūtra, the more intelligible it is, the more enigmatical it is, the more modern will it prove^{*}.

But the literature of the Sūtras can by no means be said to rest entirely upon the Brāhmanas, for these, as a rule, give too exclusive a prominence to the ritual of the sacrifice. Indeed, it is only one particular division of the Sūtras—viz., the Kalpa-Sūtras, aphorisms exclusively devoted to the consideration of this ritual¹⁰—which bears

feeling and evanescent words and syllables (i). Or is the notion of the imperishable λόγος at the root of this signification? [In the *Errata* to the first German edition it was pointed out, on the authority of a communication received from Professor Aufrecht, that *akṣara* is twice used in the Rik of the 'measuring of speech,' viz., i. 164. 24 (47) and ix. 13. 3, and consequently may there mean 'syllable.' According to the St. Petersburg Dictionary, this latter meaning is to be derived from the idea of 'the constant, simple element in language']

⁹ On the mutual relations of the Brāhmanas and Sūtras see also *I St.*, viii 76 77, ix 353, 354.

^{*} Precisely as in the case of the Brāhmanas, so also in the case of the Kalpas, i.e., Kalpa Sūtras Pāṇini, iv 3 105, distinguishes those composed by the ancients from those that are nearer to his own time.

¹⁰ On the sacrifice and sacrificial implements of the Śrauta-Sūtras, see M. Müller in *Z. D. M. G.*, ix. xxxvi - lxxxii. Haug's notes to a translation of the Āitareya Brāhmaṇa, and my paper *Zur Kenntnis des vedischen Opfersystems*, *I St.*, x. xii.

the special name of Śrauta-Sūtras, i.e., "Sūtras founded on the Śruti." The sources of the other Sūtras must be sought else where

Side by side with the Śrauta-Sūtras we are met by a second family of ritual Sūtras, the so-called Grihya-Sutras, which treat of domestic ceremonies, those celebrated at birth and before it, at marriage, as well as at death and after it. The origin of these works is sufficiently indicated by their title, since, in addition to the name of Grihya-Sūtras, they also bear that of Smṛta-Sūtras, i.e., "Sutras founded on the Smṛiti." Smṛiti, 'memory,' i.e., that which is the subject of memory, can evidently only be distinguished from Śruti, 'hearing,' i.e., that which is the subject of hearing, in so far as the former impresses itself on the memory directly, without special instruction and provision for the purpose. It belongs to all, it is the property of the whole people, it is supported by the consciousness of all, and does not therefore need to be specially inculcated. Custom and law are common property and accessible to all, ritual, on the contrary, though in like manner arising originally from the common consciousness, is developed in its details by the speculations and suggestions of individuals and remains so far the property of the few, who, favoured by external circumstances, understand how to inspire the people with a due awe of the importance and sanctity of their institutions. It is not, however, to be assumed from this that Smṛiti, custom and law, did not also undergo considerable alterations in the course of time. The mass of the immigrants had a great deal too much on their hands in the subjugation of the aborigines to be in a position to occupy themselves with other matters. Their whole energies had, in the first instance, to be concentrated upon the necessity of holding their own against the enemy. When this had been effected, and resistance was broken down, they awoke suddenly to find themselves bound and shackled in the hands of other and far more powerful enemies, or rather, they did not awake at all, their physical powers had been so long and so exclusively exercised and expended to the detriment of their intellectual energy, that the latter had gradually dwindled away altogether. The history of these new enemies was this. The knowledge of the ancient songs

with which, in their ancient homes, the Indians had worshipped the powers of nature, and the knowledge of the ritual connected with these songs, became more and more the exclusive property of those whose ancestors perhaps composed them, and in whose families this knowledge had been hereditary. These same families remained in the possession of the traditions connected with them, and which were necessary to their explanation. To strangers in a foreign country, anything brought with them from home becomes invested with a halo of sacredness, and thus it came about that these families of singers became families of priests, whose influence was more and more consolidated in proportion as the distance between the people and their former home increased, and the more their ancient institutions were banished from their minds by external struggles. The guardians of the ancestral customs, of the primitive forms of worship, took an increasingly prominent position, became the representatives of these, and, finally, the representatives of the Divine itself. For so ably had they used their opportunities, that they succeeded in founding a hierarchy the like of which the world has never seen. To this position it would have been scarcely possible for them to attain but for the enervating climate of Hindustan, and the mode of life induced by it, which exercised a deteriorating influence upon a race unaccustomed to it. The families also of the petty kings who had formerly reigned over individual tribes held a more prominent position in the larger kingdoms which were of necessity founded in Hindustan, and thus arose the military caste. Lastly, the people proper, the *Vīśas*, or settlers, united to form a third caste, and they in their turn naturally reserved to themselves prerogatives over the fourth caste, or *Śūdras*. This last was composed of various mixed elements, partly, perhaps, of an Aryan race which had settled earlier in India, partly of the aborigines themselves, and partly again of those among the immigrants, or their Western kinsmen, who refused adherence to the new Brahmanical order. The royal

* Who were distinguished by their colour, for caste. [See I. *St.*, x. 4, very colour from the three other 10] castes, hence the name *varna*, i.e.

families, the warriors, who, it may be supposed, strenuously supported the priesthood so long as it was a question of robbing the people of their rights now that this was effected turned against their former allies, and sought to throw off the yoke that was likewise laid upon them. These efforts were, however, unavailing, the colossus was too firmly established. Obscure legends and isolated allusions are the only records left to us in the later writings, of the sacrilegious hands which ventured to attack the sacred and divinely consecrated majesty of the Brahmans, and these are careful to note, at the same time, the terrible punishments which befell those impious offenders. The fame of many a Barbarossa has here passed away and been forgotten!

The Smārta-Sūtras, which led to this digression, generally exhibit the complete standpoint of Brahmanism. Whether in the form of actual records or of compositions orally transmitted, they in any case date from a period when more than men cared to lose of the Smṛiti—that precious tradition passed on from generation to generation—was in danger of perishing. Though, as we have just seen, it had undergone considerable modifications, even in the families who guarded it, through the influence of the Brahmans, yet this influence was chiefly exercised with reference to its political bearings, leaving domestic manners and customs¹¹ untouched in their ancient form, so that these works cover a rich treasure of ideas and conceptions of extreme antiquity. It is in them also that we have to look for the beginnings of the Hindu legal literature,¹² whose subject-matter, indeed, in part corresponds exactly to theirs, and whose authors bear for the most part the same names as those of the Grihya-Sūtras. With the strictly legal portions of the law-books, those dealing with

¹¹ For the ritual relating to birth see Speijer's book on the *Jātakarman* (Leyden, 1872)—for the marriage ceremonies, Haas's paper, *Ueber die Heirathsgebräuche der alten Inder*, with additions by myself in *I St.*, v. 267, ff., also my paper *Vedische Hochzeitsprüche*, *ibid.*, p. 177, ff. (1862)—on the burial of the dead, Roth in *Z. D. M. G.*, viii. 487, ff.

(1854) and M. Müller, *ibid.* IX. 1.-xxxvi. (1855) and lastly, O. Donner's *Pindapitriyama* (1870).

¹² Besides the Grihya Sūtras we find some texts directly called Dharma-Sūtras, or Sāmāyāchārika Sūtras which are specified as portions of Śrauta Sūtras, but which were no doubt subsequently inserted into these.

civil law, criminal law, and political law, we do not, it is true, find more than a few points of connection in these Sūtras, but probably these branches were not codified at all until the pressure of actual imminent danger made it necessary to establish them on a secure foundation. The risk of their gradually dying out was, owing to the constant operation of the factors involved, not so great as in the case of domestic customs. But a far more real peril threatened them in the fierce assaults directed against the Brahmanical polity by the gradually increasing power of Buddhism. Buddhism originally proceeded purely from theoretical heterodoxy regarding the relation of matter to spirit, and similar questions, but in course of time it addressed itself to practical points of religion and worship, and thenceforth it imperilled the very existence of Brahmanism, since the military caste and the oppressed classes of the people generally availed themselves of its aid in order to throw off the overwhelming yoke of priestly domination. The statement of Megasthenes, that the Indians in his time administered law only *α-ο μνήμη*, 'from memory,' I hold therefore to be perfectly correct, and I can see no grounds for the view that *μνήμη* is but a mistranslation of Smṛiti in the sense of Smṛiti-Sāstra, 'a treatise on Smṛiti.*' For the above-mentioned reason, however—in consequence of the development of Buddhism into an anti-Brahmanical religion—the case may have altered soon afterwards, and a code, that of Manu, for example (founded on the Manava Gṛihya-Sūtra), may have been drawn up. But this work belongs not to the close of the Vedic, but to the beginning of the following period.

As we have found, in the Smṛiti, an independent basis for the Gṛihya-Sūtras—in addition to the Brahmanas, where but few points of contact with these Sūtras can be traced—so too shall we find an independent basis for those Sūtras the contents of which relate to language. In this case it is in the recitation of the songs and formulas at the sacrifice that we shall find it. Although accordingly, these

* This latter view has been best set forth by Schwanbeck *Ugenda* p. 4.]
Ugenda, pp. 50-51. [But see also Bur-

Sūtras stand on a level with the Brahmanas, which owe their origin to the same source, yet this must be understood as applying only to those views on linguistic relations which, being presupposed in the Sūtras, must be long anterior to them. It must not be taken as applying to the works themselves, inasmuch as they present the results of these antecedent investigations in a collected and systematic form. Obviously also, it was a much more natural thing to attempt, in the first instance, to elucidate the relation of the prayer to the sacrifice, than to make the form in which the prayer itself was drawn up a subject of investigation. The more sacred the sacrificial performance grew, and the more fixed the form of worship gradually became, the greater became the importance of the prayers belonging to it, and the stronger their claim to the utmost possible purity and safety. To effect this, it was necessary, first, to fix the text of the prayers, secondly, to establish a correct pronunciation and recitation, and, lastly, to preserve the tradition of their origin. It was only after the lapse of time, and when by degrees their literal sense had become foreign to the phase into which the language had passed—and this was of course much later the case with the priests, who were familiar with them, than with the people at large—that it became necessary to take precautions for securing and establishing the sense also. To attain all these objects, those most conversant with the subject were obliged to give instruction to the ignorant, and circles were thus formed around them of travelling scholars, who made pilgrimages from one teacher to another according as they were attracted by the fame of special learning. These researches were naturally not confined to questions of language, but embraced the whole range of Brahmanical theology, extending in like manner to questions of worship, dogma, and speculation, all of which, indeed, were closely interwoven with each other. We must at any rate, assume among the Brahmans of this period a very stirring intellectual life, in which even the women took an active part, and which accounts still further for the superiority maintained and exercised by the Brahmans over the rest of the people. Nor did the military caste hold aloof from these inquiries, especially after they had succeeded in securing a time of repose from

external warfare. We have here a faithful copy of the scholastic period of the Middle Ages, sovereigns whose courts form the centres of intellectual life, Brahmans who with lively emulation carry on their inquiries into the highest questions the human mind can propound, women who with enthusiastic ardour plunge into the mysteries of speculation impressing and astonishing men by the depth and loftiness of their opinions, and who—while in a state which, judging from description, seems to have been a kind of somnambulism—solve the questions proposed to them on sacred subjects. As to the quality of their solutions, and the value of all these inquiries generally, that is another matter. But neither have the scholastic subtleties any absolute worth in themselves, it is only the striving and the effort which ennoble the character of any such period.

The advance made by linguistic research during this epoch was very considerable. It was then that the text of the prayers was fixed, that the redaction of the various Samhitas took place. By degrees, very extensive precautions were taken for this purpose. For their study (Patha), as well as for the different methods of preserving them—whether by writing or by memory, for either is possible¹²—such special injunctions are given, that it seems

¹² All the technical terms, however, which occur for study of the Veda and the like, uniformly refer to speaking and reciting only and thereby point to exclusively oral tradition. The writing down of the Vedic texts seems indeed not to have taken place until a comparatively late period. See *I St* v 18, ff (1861) Müller *Anc S Lit* p 507, ff (1859) Westergaard, *Ueber den ältesten Zeitraum der indischen Geschichte* (1860, German translation 1862 p 42, ff) and Haug, *Leber das Wissen des vedischen Acentis* (1873 p 16, ff), have declared themselves in favour of this theory. Haug thinks that those Brahmans who were converted to Buddhism were the first who consigned the Veda to writing—for polemical purposes—and that they were followed

by the rest of the Brahmans. On the other hand, Goldstucker Boltz, Whitney, and Roth (*Der Atharvaveda in Kashmir*, p 10), are of the opposite opinion holding in particular, that the authors of the *Prātiśākhya*s must have had written texts before them. Benfey also formerly shared this view but recently (*Einführung in die Grammatik der ved. Sprache* p 31) he has expressed the belief that the Vedic texts were only committed to writing at a late date, long subsequent to their 'diachronous'. Durnell also *I c*, p 10 is of opinion that, amongst other things the very scarcity of the material for writing in ancient times "almost precludes the existence of MSS of books or long documents."

all but impossible that any alteration in the text, except in the form of interpolation, can have taken place since These directions, as well as those relating to the pronunciation and recitation of the words, are laid down in the *Pratishakhya-Sútras*, writings with which we have but recently been made acquainted * Such a *Pratishakhya-Sútra* uniformly attaches itself to the *Samhita* of a single Veda only but it embraces all the schools belonging to it, it gives the general regulations as to the nature of the sounds employed, the euphonic rules observed, the accent and its modifications, the modulation of the voice, &c. Further, all the individual cases in which peculiar phonetic or other changes are observed are specially pointed out, ¹⁴ and we are in this way supplied with an excellent critical means of arriving at the form of the text of each *Samhita* at the time when its *Pratishakhya* was composed. If we find in any part of the *Samhitá* phonetic peculiarities which we are unable to trace in its *Pratishakhya*, we may rest assured that at that period this part did not yet belong to the *Samhita*. The directions as to the recital of the Veda, *1 c*, of its *Samhita*, *†* in the schools—each individual word being repeated in a variety of connections—present a very lively picture of the care with which these studies were pursued.

For the knowledge of metre also, rich materials have been handed down to us in the *Sútras*. The singers of the hymns themselves must naturally have been cognisant of the metrical laws observed in them. But we also find the technical names of some metres now and then mentioned in the later songs of the *Rik*. In the *Brahmanas* the oddest tricks are played with them, and their harmony is in some mystical fashion brought into connection with the harmony of the world, in fact stated to be its funda-

* By Roth in his essays *Zur Literatur und Geschichte des Heda*, p. 53 ff (translated in *Journal As Soc Bengal*, January 1848, p. 6, ff).

¹⁴ This indeed is the real purpose of the *Pratishakhyas*—namely, to show how the continuous *Samhitá* text is to be reconstructed out of the *Pada* text, in which the individual words of the text are given

separately in their original form unaffected by *sandhi*: i.e., the influence of the words which immediately precede and follow. Whatever else, over and above this, is found in the *Pratishakhyas* is merely accessory matter. See Whitney in *Journal Am Or Soc* iv 259 (1853).

† Strictly speaking only these (the *Samhitás*) are Veda.

mental cause. The simple minds of these thinkers were too much charmed by their rhythm not to be led into these and similar symbolisings. The further development of metre afterwards led to special inquiries into its laws. Such investigations have been preserved to us, both in Sūtras¹⁵ treating directly of metre, *e.g.*, the Nidana-Sūtra, and in the Anukramanīs, a peculiar class of works, which, adhering to the order of each Samhita, assign a poet, a metre, and a deity to each song or prayer. They may, therefore, perhaps belong to a later period than most of the Sūtras, to a time when the text of each Samhita was already extant in its final form, and distributed as we there find it into larger and smaller sections for the better regulation of its study. One of the smallest sections formed the pupil's task on each occasion.—The preservation of the tradition concerning the authors and the origin of the prayers is too intimately connected herewith to be dissociated from the linguistic Sūtras, although the class of works to which it gave rise is of an entirely different character. The most ancient of such traditions are to be found, as above stated, in the Brahmanas themselves. These latter also contain legends regarding the origin and the author of this or that particular form of worship, and on such occasions the Brāhmana frequently appeals to Gathas, or stanzas preserved by oral transmission among the people. It is evidently in these legends that we must look for the origin of the more extensive Itihāsas and Purānas, works which but enlarged the range of their subject, but which in every other respect proceeded after the same fashion, as is shown by several of the earlier fragments preserved, *e.g.*, in the Maha-Bharata. The most ancient work of the kind hitherto known is the Brihad-devata by Śaunaka, in *ślokas*, which, however, strictly follows the order of the Rik-Samhitā, and proves by its very title that it has only an accidental connection with this class of works. Its object properly is to specify the deity for each verse of the Rik-Samhita. But in so doing, it supports its views with so many legends, that we are fully justified in classing it here. It, however, like the other Anukramanīs belongs to a much later period than most

¹⁵ See Part I of my paper on Indian Prosody, *J. St.*, viii. 1, § (1863)

of the Sūtras, since it presupposes Yaska, the author of the Nirukti, of whom I have to speak presently, it is, in fact, essentially based upon his work [See Adalb Kuhn in *J St*, i 101-120]

It was remarked above, that the investigations into the literal sense of the prayers only began when this sense had gradually become somewhat obscure, and that, as this could not be the case among the priests, who were familiar with it, so soon as amongst the rest of the people, the language of the latter may at that time have undergone considerable modifications. The first step taken to render the prayers intelligible was to make a collection of synonyms, which, by virtue of their very arrangement, explained themselves, and of specially obsolete words, of which separate interpretations were then given orally. These collected words were called, from their being "ranked" "strung together" *Nigranthu* corrupted into *Nighantu*,¹⁶ and those occupied with them *Naighantukas*. One work of this kind has been actually preserved to us.¹⁶ It is in five books, of which the three first contain synonyms, the fourth, a list of specially difficult Vedic words, and the fifth, a classification of the various divine personages who figure in the Veda. We also possess one of the ancient expositions of this work, a commentary on it, called *Nirukti*, "interpretation," of which Yaska is said to be the author. It consists of twelve books to which two others having no proper connection with them were afterwards added. It is reckoned by the Indians among the so-called *Vedaṅgas*, together with Śikṣa Chhandas, and Jyotiṣa—three very late treatises on phonetics, metre, and astronomical calculations—and also with Kalpa and Vya-karana, i.e., ceremonial and grammar, two general categories of literary works. The four first names likewise originally signified the class in general,¹⁷ and it was only later that they were applied to the four individual works

* See Roth, Introduction to the Nirukti, p. xii

¹⁶ To this place belong further, the *Nighantu* to the Atharva & mentioned by Haug (cf. *J St* ix 175 176) and the *Nigama Rāṣa śāṣṭa* of the White Yajus

¹⁷ Śikṣā still continues to be the name of a species. A considerable number of treatises so entitled have recently been found, and more are constant y being brought to light. Cf. Kielhorn *J St*, xiv 160

now specially designated by those titles. It is in Yaska's work, the *Nirukti*, that we find the first general notions of grammar. Starting from the phonetic rules, the observance of which the *Pratishakhyas* had already established with so much minuteness—but only for each of the *Veda-Samhitas*—advance was no doubt gradually made, in the first place, to a general view of the subject of phonetics, and thence to the remaining portions of the domain of language. Inflection, derivation, and composition were recognised and distinguished, and manifold reflections were made upon the modifications thereby occasioned in the meaning of the root. Yaska mentions a considerable number of grammatical teachers who preceded him, some by name individually, others generally under the name of *Nairuktas*, *Vaiyakaranas*, from which we may gather that a very brisk activity prevailed in this branch of study. To judge from a passage in the *Kaushitaki-Brahmana*, linguistic research must have been carried on with peculiar enthusiasm in the North of India, and accordingly, it is the northern, or rather the north-western district of India that gave birth to the grammarian who is to be looked upon as the father of Sanskrit grammar, Panini. Now, if Yaska himself must be considered as belonging only to the last stages of the Vedic period, Panini—from Yaska to whom is a great leap—must have lived at the very close of it, or even at the beginning of the next period. Advance from the simple designation of grammatical words by means of terms corresponding to them in sense, which we find in Yaska, to the algebraic symbols of Panini, implies a great amount of study in the interval. Besides Panini himself presupposes some such symbols as already known, he cannot therefore be regarded as having invented, but only as having consistently carried out a method which is certainly in a most eminent degree suited to its purpose.

Lastly, Philosophical Speculation also had its peculiar development contemporaneously with, and subsequently to, the *Brahmanas*. It is in this field and in that of grammar that the Indian mind attained the highest pitch of its marvellous fertility in subtle distinctions, however abstruse or naive, on the other hand, the method may occasionally be.

Several hymns of a speculative purport in the last book of the Rik Samhita testify to a great depth and concentration of reflection upon the fundamental cause of things, necessarily implying a long period of philosophical research in a preceding age. This is borne out by the old renown of Indian wisdom, by the reports of the companions of Alexander as to the Indian gymnosophists, &c.

It was inevitable that at an early stage, and as soon as speculation had acquired some vigour, different opinions and starting-points should assert themselves, more especially regarding the origin of creation, for this, the most mysterious and difficult problem of all, was at the same time the favourite one. Accordingly, in each of the Brahmanas, one at least, or it may be more, accounts on the subject may be met with, while in the more extensive works of this class we find a great number of different conjectures with regard to cosmogony. One of the principal points of difference naturally was whether indiscrete matter or spirit was to be assumed as the First Cause. The latter theory became gradually the orthodox one, and is therefore the one most frequently, and indeed almost exclusively represented in the Brahmanas. From among the adherents of the former view, which came by degrees to be regarded as heterodox there arose, as thought developed, enemies still more dangerous to orthodoxy, who, although they confined themselves in the first place solely to the province of theory before long threw themselves into practical questions also, and eventually became the founders of the form of belief known to us as Buddhism. The word *buddha* "awakened enlightened," was originally a name of honour given to all sages including the orthodox. This is shown by the use both of the root *budh* in the Brahmanas, and of the word *buddha* itself in even the most recent of the Vedantic writings. The technical application of the word is as much the secondary one as it is in the case also of another word of the kind, *sramana*, which was in later times appropriated by the Buddhists as peculiarly their own. Here not merely the corresponding use of the root *śram*, but also the word *śramana* itself as a title of honour, may be pointed out in several passages in the Brahmanas. Though Megasthenes, in a passage quoted by Strabo, draws a distinct line between two sects

of philosophers, the *Βραχμᾶνες* and the *Σαρμάναι*, yet we should hardly be justified in identifying the latter with the Buddhist mendicants at least, not exclusively; for he expressly mentions the *υλόβιοι*—*ιε*, the Brahmacharins and Vanaprasthas, the first and third of the stages into which a Brahman's life is distributed—as forming part of the *Σαρμάναι*. The distinction between the two sects probably consisted in this, that the *Βραχμᾶνες* were the “philosophers” by birth, also those who lived as householders (*Grihasthas*), the *Σαρμάναι*, on the contrary, those who gave themselves up to special mortifications and who might belong also to other castes. The *Πράμναι*, mentioned by Strabo in another passage (see Lassen, *I AK* 1 836), whom, following the accounts of Alexander's time, he describes as accomplished polemical dialecticians, in contradistinction to the *Βραχμᾶνες*, whom he represents as chiefly devoted to physiology and astronomy, appear either to be identical with the *Σαρμάναι*—a supposition favoured by the fact that precisely the same things are asserted of both—or else, with Lassen, they may be regarded as *Pramanas*, *ιε*, founding their belief on *pramāna*, logical proof, instead of revelation. As, however, the word is not known in the writings of that period, we should in this case hardly be justified in accepting Strabo's report as true of Alexander's time, but only of a later age. Philosophical systems are not to be spoken of in connection with this period, only isolated views and speculations are to be met with in those portions of the Brahmanas here concerned, viz., the so-called Upanishads (*upanishad*, a session, a lecture). Although there prevails in these a very marked tendency to systematise and subdivide, the investigations still move within a very narrow and limited range. Considerable progress towards systematising, and expansion is visible in the Upanishads found in the *Āraṇyakas*,* *ιε*, writings supplementary to the Brahmanas, and specially designed for the *υλόβιοι*, and still greater progress in those Upanishads which stand by themselves, *ιε*,

* The name *Āraṇyaka* occurs first in the *śrīraṇyaka* to Pāṇi 17 2 129 (see on this, *I St* v 49) then in *Mānu* 17 123 *Yājñavalkya* 1 145 (in both

passages in contradistinction to *Veda* 1, iii 110 209 and in the *Ātharvopanishads* (see *I St*, ii 179)

those which, although perhaps originally annexed to a Brahmana or an Aranyaka of one of the three older Vedas, have come down to us at the same time—or, it may be, have come down to us only—in an Atharvan recension. Finally, those Upanishads which are directly attached to the Atharva-Veda are complete vehicles of developed philosophical systems, they are to some extent sectarian in their contents, in which respect they reach down to the time of the Puranas. That, however, the fundamental works now extant of the philosophical systems, viz., their Sūtras, were composed much later than has hitherto been supposed, is conclusively proved by the following considerations. In the first place, the names of their authors are either not mentioned at all in the most modern Brahmanas and Aranyakas or, if they are, it is under a different form and in other relations—in such a way, however, that their later acceptance is already foreshadowed and exhibited in the germ. Secondly, the names of the sages mentioned in the more ancient of them are only in part identical with those mentioned in the latest liturgical Sūtras. And, thirdly, in all of them the Veda is expressly presupposed as a whole, and direct reference is also made to those Upanishads which we are warranted in recognising as the latest real Upanishads, nay, even to such as are only found attached to the Atharvan. The style, too, the enigmatical conciseness, the mass of technical terms—although these are not yet endowed with an algebraic force—imply a long previous period of special study to account for such precision and perfection. The philosophical Sūtras, as well as the grammatical Sūtra, should therefore be considered as dating from the beginning of the next period, within which both are recognised as of predominant authority.

In closing this survey of Vedic literature, I have lastly to call attention to two other branches of science, which, though they do not appear to have attained in this period to the possession of a literature—at least not one of which direct relics and records have reached us—must yet have enjoyed considerable cultivation—I mean Astronomy and Medicine. Both received their first impulse from the exigencies of religious worship. Astronomical observations—though at first, of course, these were only of the

rudest description—were necessarily required for the regulation of the solemn sacrifices, in the first place, of those offered in the morning and evening, then of those at the new and full moon, and finally of those at the commencement of each of the three seasons. Anatomical observations, again, were certain to be brought about by the dissection of the victim at the sacrifice, and the dedication of its different parts to different deities. The Indo-Germanic mind, too, being so peculiarly susceptible to the influences of nature, and nature in India more than anywhere else inviting observation, particular attention could not fail to be early devoted to it. Thus we find in the later portions of the *Vajasaneyi-Samhita* and in the *Chhandogyaopaniṣad* express mention made of “observers of the stars”, and “the science of astronomy,” and, in particular, the knowledge of the twenty-seven (twenty-eight) lunar mansions was early diffused. They are enumerated singly in the *Taittirīya-Samhitā*, and the order in which they there occur is one that must necessarily* have been established somewhere between 1472 and 536 B.C. Strabo, in the above-mentioned passage, expressly assigns *ἀστρονομία* as a favourite occupation of the *Βραχμᾶνες*. Nevertheless, they had not yet made great progress at this period, their observations were chiefly confined to the course of the moon, to the solstice, to a few fixed stars, and more particularly to astrology.

As regards Medicine, we find, especially in the *Samhita* of the *Atharvan*, a number of songs addressed to illnesses and healing herbs, from which, however, there is not much to be gathered. Animal anatomy was evidently thoroughly understood, as each separate part had its own distinctive name. Alexander's companions, too, extol the Indian physicians, especially for their treatment of snake-bite.

* See *I St.*, ii 240, note. [The correct numbers are rather 2780-1820 B.C.; see *I St.*, x 234-236 (1866).] It seems to be that contained in the *Jyotisha*, we obtain the years 1820-860, *ibid.* p. 236, ff. See further and for the *Charanī* series, which the remarks in note 2 above.]

From this preliminary survey of Vedic literature we now pass to the details. Adhering strictly to the Indian classification, we shall consider each of the four Vedas by itself, and deal with the writings belonging to them in their proper order, in connection with each Veda separately.

And first of the *Rigveda*. The *Rigveda-Samhitā* presents a twofold subdivision—the one purely external, having regard merely to the compass of the work, and evidently the more recent, the other more ancient, and based on internal grounds. The former distribution is that into eight *ashtakas* (eighths), nearly equal in length, each of which is again subdivided into as many *adhyāyas* (lectures), and each of these again into about 33 (2006 in all) *ṛcikas* (sections), usually consisting of five verses.¹⁸ The latter is that into ten *mandalas* (circles), 85 *anuvākas* (chapters), 1017 *sūktas* (hymns), and 10 580 *ṛcikas* (verses), it rests on the variety of authors to whom the hymns are ascribed. Thus the first and tenth *mandalas* contain songs by Rishis of different families, the second *mandala*, on the contrary (*asht* II. 71–113), contains songs belonging to Gṛtsamada, the third (*asht* II. 114–119, III. 1–56) belongs to Viśvamitra, the fourth (*asht* III. 57–114) to Vamadeva, the fifth (*asht* III. 115–122, IV. 1–79) to Atri, the sixth (*asht* IV. 80–140, V. 1–14) to Bharadvāja, the seventh (*asht* V. 15–118) to Vasishtha, the eighth (*asht* V. 119–129, VI. 1–81) to Kanva, and the ninth (*asht* VI. 82–124, VII. 1–71) to Aṅgiras.¹⁹ By the names of these Rishis we must understand not merely the individuals, but also their families. The hymns in each separate *mandala* are arranged in the order of the deities addressed.²⁰ Those addressed to Agni occupy the first place, next come those

¹⁸ For particulars see *J. St.*, III. 255. Muller, *Anc. S. Lit.*, p. 220.

¹⁹ The first *mandala* contains 24 *anuvākas* and 191 *sūktas*—the second 4 an. 43 s., the third 5 an. 62 s., the fourth 5 an. 58 s., the fifth 6 an. 87 s., the sixth 6 an. 75 s., the seventh 6 an. 104 s., the eighth 10 an. 92 s. (beides 11 *valakūṣa*

sūktas), the ninth 7 an. 114 s., and the tenth 12 an. 191 s.

²⁰ Delbrück, in his review of *Seebenius Lieder des Rigveda* (cf. note 32) in the *Jenaer Literaturzeitung* (1875, p. 867), points out that in books 2–7 the hymns to Agni and Indra are arranged in a descending gradation as regards the number of verses.

to Indra, and then those to other gods. This, at least, is the order in the first eight *mandalas*. The ninth is addressed solely to Soma, and stands in the closest connection with the *Sāma-Samhita*, one-third of which is borrowed from it, whereas the tenth *mandala* stands in a very special relation to the *Atharva-Samhita*. The earliest mention of this order of the *mandalas* occurs in the *Āitareya-Aranyaka* and in the two *Grihya-Sūtras* of *Āśvalayana* and *Saṅkhāyana*. The *Pratīśakhya*s and *Yaska* recognise no other division, and therefore give to the *Rik-Samhita* the name of *daśatayyas*, i.e., the songs "in ten divisions," a name also occurring in the *Sama-Sūtras*. The *Anukramanī* of *Katyayana*, on the contrary, follows the division into *ashtakas* and *adhyāyas*. The name *sūkta*, as denoting hymn, appears for the first time in the second part of the *Brahmana* of the White Yajus, the *Rig-Brāhmanas* do not seem to be acquainted with it,²⁰ but we find it in the *Āitareya-Aranyaka*, &c. The extant recension of the *Rik-Samhita* is that of the *Sakalas* and belongs specially, it would seem, to that branch of this school which bears the name of the *Saśiriyas*. Of another recension, that of the *Vashkalas*, we have but occasional notices but the difference between the two does not seem to have been considerable. One main distinction, at all events, is that its eighth *mandala* contains eight additional hymns, making 100 in all, and that, consequently, its sixth *ashtaka* consists of 132 hymns.²¹ The name of the *Sakalas* is evidently related to *Śakalya*, a sage often mentioned in the *Brahmanas* and *Sutras*, who is

²⁰ This is a mistake. They know the word not only in the above, but also in a technical sense, viz. as a designation of one of the six parts of the *śaṣṭa* ("canon"), more especially of the main substance of it when thus applied, *sūktas* appears to a collective meaning comprising several *sūktas*. Cf. *Sākhī Brāhmaṇa*, xiv 1.

²¹ I am at present unable to corroborate this statement in detail. I can only show from *Sūnaka's Anuvākinukramanī*, that the recension of the *Vashkalas* had eight hymns more than that of the *Sakalas* but not that these eight hymns

formed part of the eighth *mandala*. When I wrote the above I was probably thinking of the *Vāśikulyas*, whose number is given by *Sīvaṇa*, in his commentary on the *Āit. Br.*, as eight (cf. *Poth, Zur Litt. und Gesch. des Weds.*, p. 33. Haug on *Āit. Br.*, 6 24, p. 416), whereas the editions of *Müller* and *Aufrecht* have eleven. But as to whether these eight or eleven *Vāśikulyas* belong specially to the *Vashkalas*, I cannot at present produce any direct evidence. On other differences of the *Vāśikala* school &c. see *Adalfr. Kuhn*, 10 *J. St.*, 1 108 ff.

stated by Yaska²² to be the author of the Padapatha* of the Rik-Samhita.† According to the accounts in the Brahmana of the White Yajus (the Satapatha-Brahmana) a Sakalya, surnamed Vidagdha (the cunning ?), lived contemporaneously with Yajnavalkya as a teacher at the court of Janaka, King of Videha, and that as the declared adversary and rival of Yajnavalkya. He was vanquished and cursed by the latter, his head dropped off, and his bones were stolen by robbers—Varkali also (a local form of Vashkali) is the name of one of the teachers mentioned in the second part of the Satapatha-Brahmana²³

The Śakalas appear in tradition as intimately connected with the Śunakas, and to Saunaka in particular a number of writings are attributed,‡ which he is said to have composed with a view to secure the preservation of the text (*rigvedagupṭaye*), as, for instance, an Anukramanī of the Rishis, of the metres, of the deities, of the *anuvākas*, of the hymns, an arrangement (? Vidhana) of the verses and their constituent parts,²⁴ the above-mentioned Brihaddevata,

²² Or rather Durga, in his comment on Nir. iv. 4, see Roth, p. 39, in introduction, p. lxxvii.

* This is the designation of that peculiar method of reciting the Veda in which each word of the text stands by itself unmodified by the euphonic changes it has to undergo when connected with the preceding and following words. [See above p. 23.]

† His name seems to point to the north-west (!). The scholar, on Pāṇini [iv. 2. 117] at least, probably following the Mahābhāṣya, cites Sakala in connection with the Bāhiḥ. See also Burnouf, *Introduction à l'Hist. du Buddh.* p. 620 ff. The passage in the *sūtra* of Pāṇini, iv. 3. 123, has no local reference [on the data from the Mahābhāṣya bearing on this point, see *I St.*, xiii. 366, 372, 409, 428, 445]. On the other hand we find Śākya also in the Kosala country in Kapilvastu of whom, however as of the Śākyaṇas in the Yajus we do not exactly know what to make (see below). [The earliest mention of the word Sakali in immediate reference

to the Rik, occurs in a memorial verse, *yajñagāthā*, quoted in the *Art. Brāhm.*, iii. 43 (see *I St.*, ix. 277). —For the name Śakṛīya I can only cite the *prastāra* section added at the close of the *Āśvalāyana Śrauta-Sūtra*, in which the Śakṛīya are mentioned several times, partly by themselves partly beside and in association with the Śuṅgas.]

²³ This form of name, which might be traced to *vṛkaka*, occurs also in the *Śākhāyana Āraṇyaka* viii. 2. “*astūsatasya Varkalino brāhmarāharabhaṣṭapadyant*” though the parallel passage in the *Āitar Āraṇy.*, iii. 8, otherwise similarly worded reads instead of ‘*Varkalino*, *vā* (i.e., *rai*) *Arkalino*!’

‡ By Śaṅkaraśiṣya, in the introduction to his commentary on the *Pig Anukramanī* of Kātyāyana.

²⁴ Rather two *Vidhāna* texts (see below), the one of which has for its object the application of particular *vidhas* the other probably that of particular *vidhas* to superstitious purposes after the manner of the *Samavidhāna Brāhmaṇa*.

the *Prātisākhya* of the Rik a Smārta-Sūtra,* and also a Kalpa-Sūtra referring specially to the *Āitareya*, which, however, he destroyed after one had been composed by his pupil, *Āśvalayana*. It is not perhaps, on the face of it, impossible that all these writings might be the work of one individual *Saunaka*, still they probably, nay, in part certainly, belong only to the school which bears his name. But, in addition to this, we find that the second *mandala* of the *Saṃhita* itself is attributed to him, and that, on the other hand, he is identified with the *Saunaka* at whose sacrificial feast *Sauti*, the son of *Vaisampayana*, is said to have repeated the *Maha-Bhārata*, recited by the latter on an earlier occasion to *Janamejaya* (the second) together with the *Harivaṃśa*. The former of these assertions must, of course, only be understood in the sense that the family of the *Śaunakas* both belonged to the old Rishi families of the Rik, and continued still later to hold one of the foremost places in the learned world of the Brahmans. Against the second statement, on the contrary, no direct objection can be urged, and it is at least not impossible that the teacher of *Āśvalayana* and the sacrificer in the *Naimisha*† forest are identical.—In the *Brahmana* of the White Yajus we have, further two distinct *Saunakas* mentioned, the one *Indrota*, as sacrificial priest of the prince who, in the *Maha-Bhārata*, appears as the first *Janamejaya* (*Parikṣita*, so also in *M. Bh.* xii. 5595, ff), the other, *Saundaryana*, as *Audichya*, dwelling in the north.

As author of the *Kṛma-patha* of the Rik-*Saṃhita* a *Pañchala Babhravya*‡ is mentioned. Thus we see that to the Kuru-Pañchalas and the Kosala-Videhas (to whom *Saṃhita* belongs) appertains the chief merit of having fixed and arranged the text of the Rik, as well as that of the Yajus,

* On the *Grhya* of *Saunaka*, see *Steuzler / St.* i. 243.

† The sacrifice conducted by this *Saunaka* in the *Naimisha* forest would in any case, have to be distinguished from the great sacrificial festival of the *Naimishya* § of en mentioned in the *Bṛahmaras*.

‡ In the Rik *Prāt.* xi. 33 merely *Babhravya*, only in *Ūt* a settlement is he designated as a *Pañchala*. As, however, the *Āśvalāyana* are twice

quoted as an authority in the text of the Rik *Prātisākhya* itself viz., ii. 12. 44 and that beside the *Prichyas* (people of the east) the above conclusion still hold good. See *Pooner on Rik Pr.* ii. 12. p. 113. Compare also *Śākh. Śr.* xii. 13. 6 (*pañcha'apadarrutā*) and *Saṃhita-paṇḍita* *Brāhminas*, § 2 (*samvatsara Prātisākhya Pañchalaśākhya* *am vatsara vaktā*).

and this was probably accomplished, in the case of both Vedas, during the most flourishing period of these tribes.

For the origin of the songs themselves we must go back, as I have already repeatedly stated to a far earlier period. This is most clearly shown by the mythological and geographical data contained in them.

The former, the mythological relations, represented in the older hymns of the Rik, in part carry us back to the primitive Indo-Germanic time. They contain relics of the childlike and naive conceptions then prevailing, such as may also be traced among the Teutons and Greeks. So for instance, the idea of the change of the departed spirit into air, which is conducted by the winged wind as by a faithful dog, to its place of destination, as is shown by the identity of *Saramēya* and *Ἑρμείας*,* of *Sabala* and *Κεφάρος*†. Further, the idea of the celestial sea, *Varuna*, *Οὐρανός*, encompassing the world, of the Father-Heaven *Dyaushpitar*, *Ζεύς*, *Jupiter*, of the Mother-Earth, *Ζημὴτηρ*, of the waters of the sky as shining nymphs, of the sun's rays as cows at pasture, of the dark cloud-god as the robber who carries off these maidens and cows, and of the mighty god who wields the lightning and thunderbolt, and who chastises and strikes down the ravisher, and other such notions‡. Only the faintest outlines of this comparative mythology are as yet discernible, it will unquestionably, however, by degrees claim and obtain, in relation to classical mythology a position exactly analogous to that which has already in fact, been secured by comparative Indo-Germanic grammar in relation to classical grammar. The ground on which that mythology has hitherto stood trembles beneath it, and the new light about to be shed upon it we owe to the hymns of the Rig-veda, which enable us to glance, as it were, into the workshop whence it originally proceeded §.

* See Kuhn in *Haupt's Deutsche Zeitschrift*, vi 125 ff.

† I St ii 29^m [and still earlier Max Müller see in *Chips from a German's tool* ii 182].

‡ See Kuhn *loc. cit.* repeat city in the *Zeitschrift* etc. [and sometimes long and in the *Zeitschrift* with *Zeitschrift* etc. (vi 1, 125)].

§ See *Z D M G* v 112. [Since I wrote the above comparative mythology has been enriched with much valuable matter but much also that is crude and fanciful has been advanced. Deserving of special mention beside various papers by Adalbert Kuhn in his *Zeitschrift* are two papers by the same author entitled,

of the myth had become entirely obliterated. Indra is there but the quarrelsome and jealous god who subdues the unyielding giant by low cunning, and in the Indian epic the myth either still retains the same form, or else Indra is represented by a human hero, Arjuna, an incarnation of himself, who makes short work of the giant, and the kings who pass for the incarnations of the latter. The principal figures of the *Maha-Bharata* and *Ramayana* fall away like the kings of *Firdûsi*, and there remain for history only those general events in the story of the people to which the ancient myths about the gods have been applied. The personages fade into the background, and in this representation are only recognisable as poetic creations.

Thirdly, the songs of the *Rik* unfold to us particulars as to the time, place, and conditions of their origin and growth. In the more ancient of them the Indian people appear to us settled on the banks of the Indus, divided into a number of small tribes, in a state of mutual hostility, leading a patriarchal life as husbandmen and nomads, living separately or in small communities, and represented by their kings, in the eyes of each other by the wars they wage, and in presence of the gods by the common sacrifices they perform. Each father of a family acts as priest in his own house, himself kindling the sacred fire, performing the domestic ceremonies, and offering up praise and prayer to the gods. Only for the great common sacrifices—a sort of tribe-festivals, celebrated by the king—are special priests appointed, who distinguish themselves by their comprehensive knowledge of the requisite rites and by their learning, and amongst whom a sort of rivalry is gradually developed, according as one tribe or another is considered to have more or less prospered by its sacrifices. Especially prominent here is the enmity between the families of *Vaśishtha* and *Vishvamitra*, which runs through all Vedic antiquity continues to play an important part in the epic, and is kept up even to the latest times, so that, for example, a commentator of the *Veda* who claims to be descended from *Vaśishtha* leaves passages unexpounded in which the latter is stated to have had a curse imprecated upon him. This implacable hatred owes its origin to the trifling circumstance of *Vaśishtha*

having once been appointed chief sacrificial priest instead of Visvāmitra by one of the petty kings of these early times — The influence of these royal priests does not, however, at this early period, extend beyond the sacrifice, there are no castes as yet, the people is still one united whole, and bears but one name, that of *viśas*, settlers. The prince, who was probably elected, is called *Viśpati* a title still preserved in Lithuanian. The free position held by women at this time is remarkable. We find songs of the most exquisite kind attributed to poetesses and queens among whom the daughter of Atri appears in the foremost rank. As regards love, its tender, ideal element is not very conspicuous, it rather bears throughout the stamp of an undisguised natural sensuality. Marriage is, however, held sacred, husband and wife are both rulers of the house (*dampatī*), and approach the gods in united prayer. The religious sense expresses itself in the recognition of man's dependence on natural phenomena and the beings supposed to rule over them, but it is at the same time claimed that these latter are, in their turn, dependent upon human aid, and thus a sort of equilibrium is established. The religious notion of sin is consequently wanting altogether, and submissive gratitude to the gods is as yet quite foreign²⁶ to the Indian. 'Give me and I will render to thee,' he says,²⁷ claiming therewith a right on his part to divine help, which is an exchange no grace. In this free strength, this vigorous self consciousness, a very different, and a far more manly and noble, picture of the Indian is presented to us than that to which we are accustomed from later times. I have already endeavoured above to show how this state of things became gradually altered, how the fresh energy was broken, and by degrees disappeared, through the dispersion over Hindustan, and the enervating influence of the new climate. But what it was that led to the emigration of the people in such masses from the Indus across the Sarasvatī towards the Ganges,

²⁶ 'Quite foreign' is rather too strong an expression. See Polak's paper *Die höchsten Götter der urindischen Völker* in *Z. d. M. G.*, vi. 72.

(1851). There are different phases to be distinguished.

²⁷ *Vāj. S.*, vi. 50, or, "I will him, then with I sacrifice to thee." *Brhad. S.* vi. 4. 5. 6.

what was its principal cause, is still uncertain. Was it the pressure brought about by the arrival of new settlers? Was it excess of population? Or was it only the longing for the beautiful tracts of Hindustan? Or perhaps all these causes combined? According to a legend preserved in the Brahmana of the White Yajur, the priests were in a great measure the cause of this movement, by urging it upon the kings, even against their will [*I St.*, 1 178]. The connection with the ancestral home on the Indus remained, of course, at first a very close one, later on, however, when the new Brahmanical organisation was completely consolidated in Hindustan, a strong element of bitterness was infused into it, since the Brahmans looked upon their old kinsmen who had remained true to the customs of their forefathers as apostates and unbelievers.

But while the origin of the songs of the Rik dates from this primitive time, the redaction of the Rik-Samhita only took place as we observed, at a period when the Brahmanical hierarchy was fully developed, and when the Kosala-Videhas and Kuru-Pañchala* who are to be regarded as having been specially instrumental in effecting it, were in their prime. It is also certain that not a few of the songs were composed either at the time of the emigration into Hindustan or at the time of the compilation itself. Such songs are to be found in the last book especially, a comparatively large portion of which, as I have already remarked, recurs in the Atharvaveda-Samhita. It is for the critic to determine approximately in the case of each individual song, having regard to its con-

* *Mandala* x 98 is a dialogue between Devapi and Samtana the two Aauraryas as Yaska calls them. In the Mahā Bhārata Samtana is the name of the father of Bhishma and Vichitravirya by whose two wives Ambikā and Ambalika Vyāsa became the father of Dhritrashtra and Pāṇdu. This Samtana is therefore the grand father of these latter or the great-grandfather of the Pauravas and Pandavas the belligerents in the Mahā Bhārata. We should thus have to suppose that the feud de-

scribed in this epic had been fought out long before the final arrangement of the Rik Samhita. It is, however, questionable whether the Samtana or the Mahā Bhārata is identical with the Samtana mentioned in the Rik or, even if we take this for granted, whether he may not in reality have been associated with the epic legend in *majorum rei gloria*. Devapi, at least, who, according to Yaska is his brother has in the Rik a different father from the one given in the epic. See *I St.* 1 203.

tents, its ideas, its language, and the traditions connected with it, to what period it ought possibly to be ascribed. But as yet this task is only set, its solution has not yet even begun.²³

The deities to whom the songs are for the most part addressed are the following —First, Agni, the god of fire. The songs dedicated to him are the most numerous of all —a fact sufficiently indicative of the character and import of these sacrificial hymns. He is the messenger from men to the gods, the mediator between them, who with his far-shining flame summons the gods to the sacrifice, however distant they may be. He is for the rest adored essentially as earthly sacrificial fire, and not as an elemental force. The latter is rather pre-eminently the attribute of the god to whom, next to Agni, the greatest number of songs is dedicated, viz, Indra. Indra is the mighty lord of the thunderbolt, with which he rends asunder the dark clouds, so that the heavenly rays and waters may descend to bless and fertilise the earth. A great number of the hymns, and amongst them some of the most beautiful, are devoted to the battle that is fought because the malicious demon will not give up his booty, to the description of the thunderstorm generally, which, with its flashing lightnings its rolling thunders, and its furious blasts, made a tremendous impression upon the simple mind of the people. The break of day, too, is greeted, the dawns are praised as bright, beautiful maidens, and deep reverence is paid to the flaming orb of the mighty sun, as he steps forth vanquishing the darkness of night, and dissipating it to all the quarters of the heavens. The brilliant sun-god is besought for light and warmth, that seeds and flocks may thrive in gladsome prosperity.

Besides the three principal gods, Agni, Indra, and Sūrya, we meet with a great number of other divine personages, prominent amongst whom are the Maruts or winds, the faithful comrades of Indra in his battle, and Rudra, the howling, terrible god, who rules the furious tempest. It is not, however, my present task to discuss the whole of the Vedic Olympus, I had only to sketch generally

²³ See now Perle, *Upanishads*, p. 170, 1873, p. 523. I. St. 12. 57 (1854) compare *Li. cranes* (1854) 299, 301, 279, 280, I. St. 1. 19.

the ground-work and the outlines of this ancient edifice.²⁹ Besides the powers of nature, we find, as development progresses, personifications also of spiritual conceptions, of ethical import, but the adoration of these as compared with the former, is of later origin.

I have already discussed the precautions taken to secure the text of the Rik-Samhita, i.e., the question of its authenticity, and I have likewise alluded to the aids to its explanation furnished by the remaining Vedic literature. These latter reduce themselves chiefly to the Nighantus, and the Nirukta of Yaska.³⁰ Both works in their turn, found their commentators in course of time. For the Nighantus, we have the commentary of Devarajayajvan, who belongs to about the fifteenth or sixteenth century. In the introduction he enlarges upon the history of their study from which they appear to have found only one other complete commentator since Yaska viz., Shankarashvamin. For Yaska's Nirukta a commentary has been handed down to us dating from about the thirteenth century, that of Durga. Both works, moreover, the Nighantus as well as the Nirukta, exist in two different recensions. These do not materially differ from one another and chiefly in respect of arrangement only, but the very fact of their existence leads us to suppose that these works were originally transmitted orally rather than in writing. A commentary, properly so called, on the Rik-Samhita has come down to us, but it dates only from the fourteenth century, that of Sayanacharya.* "From the long series of

²⁹ Muir's *Original Sanskrit Texts*, vol. v (1870) is the best source of information for Vedic mythology.

³⁰ This name appears both in the Yajnas in the last book of the Satap Br., and in the Kāṇḍakrama of the Atreya school where he is called Iāṅgi and described as the pupil of Vāṣampāyana, and teacher of Tittiri. From Pāṇ. ii. 4. 63 it follows that Pāṇini was cognisant of the name Yāska for he there teaches the plural *Yāsas* for the personal name Yāska. Compare on this the *pravarā* section in the Aśvalavāśī Smṛiti Sūtra. The *Yāska Gāṇḍikā* are mentioned in the *Niṣkhaṇḍa* which

again is quoted by Pāṇini; see *I. Et.* iii. 475. A direct reference to Yāska is made in the Rik Prat. and in the Bṛhaddevatā; see also *I. St.* vi. 96. 245. 246.

* The circumstance that commentaries on almost all branches of the Vedas, and on various other important and extensive works as well are ascribed to Sayana and his brother Mādhyama is to be explained by the practice of travelling in India by which works composed by order of some distinguished person bear his name as the author. So in the present day the Purāṇic works for the person who publishes them, and leave

centuries* between Yaska and Sayana but scanty remains of an exegetic literature connected with the Rik-Samhita are left to us, or, at any rate, have as yet been discovered. Samkara and the Vedantic school turned their attention chiefly to the Upanishads. Nevertheless, a gloss upon a portion at least of the Rik-Samhita was drawn up by Anandatirtha, a pupil of Samkara of which there is an exposition by Jayatirtha, comprising the second and third *adhyāyas* or the first *ashṭaka*, in the Library of the India House in London." Savana himself in addition to Durga's commentary on the Nirukti only quotes Bhaṭṭa Bhaskara Miśra and Bharatasvamin as expositors of the Vedas.²¹ The former wrote a commentary upon the Taitt. Yajus, not the Rik-Samhita, in which he refers to Kasakritsna, Ekachurna, and Yaska as his predecessors in the work. For Bharatasvamin we have no further data than that his name is also cited by Devaraja (or the Nighartus), who further mentions Bhaṭṭa Bhaskara Miśra, Machatadeva, Bhavasvamin, Guhadava, Srinivasa, and Uvata. The latter, otherwise called Uata wrote a commentary on the

the fruit of the labour to him as his property. Madhava, and probably also Sāyana, were ministers at the court of King Bhuṅka at Vijayanagara, and took advantage of their position to give a fresh impetus to the study of the Veda. The writings attributed to them point, by the very difference of their contents and style, to a variety of authorship. (According to A. C. Burnell, in the preface to his edition of the Varāha-Brahmaṇḍa, p. viii, ff. (1873), the two names denote one person only. Sāyana, he says, is "the Bhoga-nāha, or mortal body, of Madhava the soul identified with Viṣṇu." Burnell is further of opinion that the twenty-nine writings current under the name of Madhava all proceed from Viṣṇu himself, translated to our language by others, and that they were composed by him during a period of about thirty of the six or five years he was 1331-1350 A.D. which he spent as abbot of the monastery at Sringeri, under

the name Viśvānagarāman. See my remarks to the contrary in *Indo-oriental Central Asia* (1873) p. 1421. Burnell prefers the form Viśvānagara to Vijayanagara. Cowell, in his note on *Collected Asian Ess.*, i. 235, has Viśvā and Vijaya* side by side.]

* See Ro's *Zur Lit.*, p. 22.

²¹ To these have to be added Skandasvamin (see p. 41) and Kaṇḍa (see below), and as anterior to Sāyana we must probably regard the works of Atmānanda Ravana, and Kanaka (or is the latter identical with Bhaṭṭa Kanaka Bhāskara Miśra? cf. Burnell, *Catalogue of Vedic MSS.* p. 121, and the *Gṛhārahatnamālā*, Burnell, *Verzeichnis*, p. xvi, ff., Muller in the preface to his large edition of the Rik-Samhita, vol. vi p. xiv, ff. Some extracts from Ravana's commentary have been published by Fitz-Edward Hall in *Journal As. Soc. Beng.* 1862, pp. 129-134.

Samhita of the White Yajus, not the Rik-Samhita, as well as commentaries on the two Pratisakhya of the Rik and the White Yajus

As regards European researches, the Rik-Samhita, as well as the other Vedas, first became known to us through Colebrooke's excellent paper "On the Vedas," in the *As Res* vol viii (Calc 1805). To Rosen we are indebted for the first text, as given partly in his *Rigveda Specimen* (London, 1830), partly in the edition of the first *ashṭaka*, with Latin translation, which only appeared after the early death of the lamented author (*ibid* 1838). Since then, some other smaller portions of the text of the Rik-Samhita have here and there been communicated to us in text or translation, especially in Roth's already often quoted and excellent *Abhandlungen zur Litteratur und Geschichte des Veda* (Stuttgart, 1846). The entire Samhita, together with the commentary of Sayana, is now being published, edited by Dr M. Muller of Oxford, at the expense of the East India Company, the first *ashṭaka* appeared in 1849. At the same time an edition of the text, with extracts from the commentary, is in course of publication in India. From Dr M. Muller, too, we may expect detailed prolegomena to his edition, which are to treat in particular of the position held by the songs of the Rik in the history of civilisation. A French translation by Langlois comprises the entire Samhita (1848-1851), it is, of course, in many respects highly useful, although in using it great caution is necessary. An English translation by Wilson is also begun, of which the first *ashṭaka* only has as yet appeared.²²

²² Muller's edition of the text, together with the commentary of Sayana, a complete index of words, and list of *pratiśa* is now complete in six vols. 1849-1875. He has also published separately the text of the first mandala in *sarṣṭi* and *pada* paths (Leipzig 1856-69) as also the whole 10 mandalas, likewise in double form (London, 1873). The first complete edition of the text was published, in Poman transliteration, by Aufrecht, in vols vi and vii of the *Indische Studien* (1861-63). Evers edition of text and commentary, in the *Bibliotheca*

Indica, Nos 1-3 (Calc 1849) only reaches to the end of the second *adhya*. A fragment of the text edited by Stevenson so long ago as 1833 extends but a little farther (i 1-35). Of Wilson's translation five volumes have appeared the last in 1866, under the editorship of Covell, brings it up to mand vi 20. Benfey published in his *Orient und Occident* (1860-68) a critical translation of mand i 1-118. Twelve hymns to the Maru are translated and furnished with a detailed commentary in vol. 1 of Max Müller's *Rigveda Samhita* (1875).

We now turn to the *Brāhmanas* of the Rik.

Of these, we have two, the *Āitareya-Brāhmaṇa* and the *Śaṅkhayana-* (or *Kausītaki-*) *Brāhmaṇa*. They are closely connected with one another, treat essentially of the same matter, not unfrequently, however, taking opposite views of the same question. It is in the distribution of their matter that they chiefly differ. In the *Śaṅkhayana-Brahmana* we have a perfectly arranged work, embracing on a definite plan the entire sacrificial procedure, but this does not seem to be the case in an equal degree in the *Āitareya-Brahmana*. The latter, moreover, appears to treat exclusively of the Soma sacrifice, whereas in the former it merely occupies the principal place. In the *Śaṅkhayana-Brahmana* we meet with nothing at all corresponding to the last ten *adhyāyas* of the *Āitareya-Brahmana*, a gap which is only filled up by the *Śaṅkhayana-Sūtra*, and for this reason, as well as from internal evidence, it may perhaps be assumed that the *adhyāyas* in question are but a later addition to the *Āitareya-Brahmana*. In the extant text, the *Āitareya-Brahmana* contains 40 *adhyāyas* (divided into eight *pañchads*, or pen-

lated and explained (London 1869). But the scholar who has done most by far for the right understanding of the Rik is Roth, both in the commentary added to his edition of Yāska's *Nirukta* (Göttingen, 1848-52), and in the great St Petersburg Sanskrit Dictionary (even vol., 1853-75), edited by Böhtlingk and him. Here we may also mention the following works—Grassmann, *Wörterbuch zum Rigveda* (1873, ff.), Delbrück, *Das altindische Verbum* (1874), Benfer, *Einleitung in die Grammatik der vedischen Sprache* (1874), and *Die Quantitätsverschiedenheiten in den Samhitā und Padātischen der Veden*, Bollensen, *Die Lieder des Parāśara* in *Z D M G* xxi (1868), *Subenzyg Lieder des Rigveda*, übersetzt von Karl Geldner und Adolf Krog mit Beiträgen von R Roth (Tübingen 1875)—reviewed by Abel Bergaigne in the *Revue Critique* Dec. 11 and 18, 1875. Alfred Ludwig, *Die Nachrichten des*

Rig und Atharvaveda über Geographie, Geschichte und Verfassung des alten Indiens (the identification here mentioned, p. 13, of the Vedic Sarasvatī with the Indus, was first made by myself in *Vj S Spec* ii So ii, 1847), and *Die philosophischen und religiösen Anschauungen des Veda* (Prag, 1875), Alfred Hillebrandt, *Leber des Götter Aditi* (Breslau 1876), H. Zimmer, *Paryajya Yajñayā Vāta Wadim in Zeitschrift für Deutsches Alterthum* New Series vii 164, ff. Lastly, we have to draw attention especially to Muir's *Original Sanskrit Texts* (5 vols., second edit. London 1868 ff.), in which the antiquarian information contained in the Rik Samhitā on the different stages and phases of Indian life at that early period is clearly and comprehensively grouped. translations of numerous Vedic passages and pieces are given.

* See on this *I S*, ii 289, [and 377].

tads) while the Śaṅkhayana-Brahmana contains 30, and it is perhaps allowable to refer to them the rule in Panini v. 1. 62, which states how the name of a Brahmana is to be formed if it contain 30 or 40 *adhyaayas*—a view which would afford external warrant also of the fact or then existence in this form in Panini's time, at all events. Geographical or similar data, from which a conclusion might be drawn as to the time of their composition, are of very rare occurrence. Most of these, together with really historical statements, are to be found in the last books of the Aitareya-Brahmana (see *I St.*, 1. 199, ff), from which it at any rate specially follows that their scene is the country of the Kuru-Pañchalas and Vāśa-Uśīnaraś (see viii. 14). In the Śaṅkhayana-Brahmana mention is made of a great sacrifice in the Naimish-forest, but this can hardly be identified with the one at which, according to the accounts of the Maha-Bharata, the second recitation of this epic took place. Another passage implies a very special prominence amongst the other gods of the deity who is afterwards known to us exclusively by the name of Śiva. He here receives, among other titles those of Íśana and Mahadeva, and we might perhaps venture to conclude from this that he was already the object of a very special worship. We are at any rate justified in inferring unless the passage is an interpolation, that the Śaṅkhayana-Brahmana ranks chronologically with the last books of the Samhita of the White Yajus and with those portions of its Brahmana and of the Atharva-Samhita in which this nomenclature is likewise found. Lastly, a third passage of the Śaṅkhayana-Brahmana implies as already hinted a special cultivation of the field or language in the northern parts of India. People resorted thither in order to become acquainted with the language and on their return enjoyed a special authority on questions connected with it. [*I St.*, ii. 309]

Both Brahmanas presuppose literary compositions of some extent as having preceded them. Thus mention is made of the *ākhyānaiśas* i.e. "those versed in tradition" and *gāthas*, *abhiyaya gāthas* a sort of memorial verses (*lullās*), are also frequently referred to and quoted. The names Rigveda Samaveda and Yajurveda as well as *trayaśulka* a term used to express them collectively repeatedly

occur. In the Śāṅkhayana Brāhmaṇa, however, special regard is had to the Pāṅgya and Kāushītaka, whose views are very frequently quoted side by side, that of the Kāushītaka being always recognised as final. The question now arises what we are to understand by these expressions, whether works of the Brāhmaṇa order already extant in a written form, or still handed down orally only—or merely the inherited tradition of individual doctrines. Mention of the Kāushītaka and the Pāṅgya occurs in the Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa only in a single passage—and that perhaps an interpolated one—in the latter part of the work. This at all events proves, what already seemed probable from its more methodical arrangement, that the Śāṅkhayana-Brāhmaṇa is to be considered a later production than the Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa, since it appears to be a recast of two sets of views of similar tenor already extant under distinct names, while the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa presents itself as a more independent effort. The name Pāṅgya belongs to one of the sages mentioned in the Brāhmaṇa of the White Yajus and elsewhere, from whose family Yaska Pāṅgi* was descended, and probably also Pṛgala the author of a treatise on metre. The *Pāṅgi Kalpa* is expressly included by the commentator of Pāṇini, probably following the Mahābhāṣya among the ancient Kalpa-Sūtras, in contradistinction to the *Āśmarathak Kalpa*, with which we shall presently become acquainted as an authority of the *Āśvalayana-Sūtra*. The Pāṅgis are, besides, frequently mentioned in early writings, and a Pāṅgi-Brāhmaṇa must still have been in existence even in Sayana's time, for he repeatedly refers to it. The case stands similarly as regards the name Kāushītaka, which is, moreover, used directly in the majority of passages where it is quoted for the Śāṅkhayana-Brāhmaṇa itself—a fact easy of explanation, as in the latter the view represented by the Kāushītaka is invariably upheld as the authoritative one, and we have in this Brāhmaṇa but a remoulding by Śāṅkhayana of the stock of dogma peculiarly the property of the Kāushītaka. Further in its commentary which it may be remarked

* The quotation from Brāhmaṇa Pāṅgi Kalpa in the Mahābhāṣya in Yaska therefore belong in part see I. St., xiii. 455.]
perhaps to the Pāṅgis. () [On the

interprets the work under the sole title of the "Kaushitaki-Brahmana" passages are frequently quoted from a Mahā-Kaushitaki-Brahmana, so that we have to infer the existence of a still larger work of similar contents,—probably a later handling of the same subject (?) This commentary further connects the Kaushitaki Brahmana with the school of the Kauthumas—a school which otherwise belongs only to the Samaveda this, however, is a relation which has not as yet been cleared up—The name Sāṅkhya-Brahmana interchanges occasionally with the form Sūṅkhya-Brahmana but the former would seem to deserve the preference, its earliest occurrence is probably in the Pratiśākhya-Sūtra of the Black Yajus

The great number of myths and legends contained in both these Brahmanas of the Rik interests them with a peculiar interest These are not indeed introduced for their own sake, but merely with a view to explain the origin of some hymn, but this, of course does not detract from their value One of them, the legend of Surahśepa which is found in the second part of the *Āitareya-Brahmana*, is translated by Roth in the *Indische Studien*, i. 458-464, and discussed in detail, *ibid.* ii. 112-123 According to him, it follows a more ancient metrical version We must indeed assume generally, with regard to many of these legends, that they had already gained a rounded, independent shape in tradition before they were incorporated into the Brahmana and of this we have frequent evidence in the distinctly archaic character of their language, compared with that of the rest of the text Now these legends possess great value for us from two points of view first because they contain, to some extent at least, directly or indirectly historical data, often stated in a plain and artless manner, but at other times disguised and only perceptible to the eye of criticism, and secondly because they present connecting links with the legends of later times, the origin of which would otherwise have remained almost entirely obscure

On the *Āitareya-Brahmana* we have a commentary by Sayana and on the *Kaushitaki-Brahmana* one by Viṣṇu-yaka a son of Madhava.³³

³³ The *Āitareya-Brahmana* has been edited by Martin Haug 2 vols. Bombay 1863 see *J. St.*, ix. 177-380 (1863)

To each of these Brahmanas is also annexed an Aranyaka, or 'forest-portion,' that is, the portion to be studied in the forest by the sages known to us through Megasthenes as *ἰλοβίται*, and also by their disciples. This forest-life is evidently only a later stage of development in Brahmanical contemplation, and it is to it that we must chiefly ascribe the depth of speculation, the complete absorption in mystic devotion by which the Hindus are so eminently distinguished. Accordingly, the writings directly designated as Aranyakas bear this character impressed upon them in a very marked degree, they consist in great part of Upanishads only, in which, generally speaking a bold and vigorous faculty of thought cannot fail to be recognised, however much of the bizarre they may at the same time contain.

The *Aitareya-Aranyaka*²³ consists of five books, each of which again is called Aranyaka. The second and third books* form a separate Upanishad, and a still further subdivision here takes place, inasmuch as the four last sections of the second book, which are particularly consonant with the doctrines of the Vedānta system, pass *κατ' ἐξοχήν* as the *Aitareyopaniṣad*²⁴. Of these two books Mahidasa Aitareya is the reputed author, he is supposed to be the son of Visāla and Itara, and from the latter his name Aitareya is derived. His name is indeed several times quoted in the course of the work itself as a final authority, a circumstance which conclusively proves the correctness of tracing to him the views therein propounded. For we must divest ourselves of the notion that a teacher of this period ever put his ideas into writing; oral delivery was his only method of imparting them to his pupils, the knowledge of them was transmitted by tradition, until it became fixed in

The legend of Sunahśepa (vii 13-18) had been discussed by Roth, see also M. Müller *Hist. of A. S. L.*, p. 573 ff. Another section of it (viii. 5-20) treating of royal inaugurations had previously been edited by Bronkhorst (Berlin 1860).

²³ The first fasciculus of an edition together with Śaṅkara's commentary, of the *Aitareya Aranyaka*, by Rājendra Lāla Mitra has just

come to hand (Nov. 30 1875) see *Bibliotheca Indica*, New Series, No. 325, the text reaches as far as a 4 1

* See *I. St.* i 388 ff.

²⁴ This *Aitareyopaniṣad* amongst others has been edited (with Śaṅkara's commentary) and translated by Foerster *B.Z. Ind.* vii 143 ff. (Cale 1850), xv 28, ff. (1853).

some definite form or other, always however retaining his name. It is in this way that we have to account for the fact of our finding the authors of works that have been handed down to us, mentioned in these works themselves. For the rest, the doctrines of Aitareya must have found especial favour, and his pupils have been especially numerous, for we find his name attached to the Brahmana as well as the *Āraṇyaka*. With respect to the former, however, no reasons can for the present be assigned, while for the fourth book of the *Āraṇyaka* we have the direct information that it belongs to *Āśvalāyana*,* the pupil of *Saunaka*, nay, this *Saunaka* himself appears to have passed for the author of the fifth book, according to Colebrooke's statements on the subject, *Misc. Ess.*, i 47, n. The name of Aitareya is not traceable anywhere in the Brahmanas, he is first mentioned in the *Chhândogyaopaniṣad*. The earliest allusion to the school of the Aitareyas is in the *Samā-Sūtras*—To judge from the repeated mention of them in the third book, the family of the Mandukas, or *Māndūkeyas*, must also have been particularly active in the development of the views there represented. Indeed, we find them specified later as one of the five schools of the *Rigveda*, yet nothing bearing their name has been preserved except an extremely abstruse *Upaniṣad*, and the *Mandūkī-Śikṣā*, a grammatical treatise. The former, however, apparently only belongs to the Atharvan and exhibits completely the standpoint of a rigid system. The latter might possibly be traced back to the *Māndūkeya* who is named here as well as in the *Rik-Pratiśakhya*.

The contents of the Aitareya-*Āraṇyaka*, as we now have it²⁵ supply no direct clue to the time of its composi-

* I find an *Āśvalāyana Brāhmaṇa* also quoted but am unable to give any particulars regarding it. [In a MS of the *Āit. Ār.* India Office Library 1886, the entire work is described at the end as *Āśvalāyanakam Aranyakam*.]

²⁵ See *I. St.*, i 387-392. I am now in possession of the complete text, but have nothing material to add to the above remarks. Great stress is laid upon keeping the particular doctrines secret, and upon

the high importance of those familiar with them. Among the names mentioned in the course of the work *Agniveśyāyana* is of significance on account of its formation. The interesting passages on the three *padhas* of the *Veda nirbhūya* = *sam-āpāṭha*, *pratirṇna* = *padapāṭha*, and *ubhayaṃ antareṇa* = *kramapāṭha* are discussed by M. Müller on *Rik. Prāt.* i 2-4 (see also *ibid.*, *Nachrage*, p. 11).

tion, other than the one already noticed, namely, that in the second chapter of the second book the extant arrangement of the Rik-Samhitā is given. Again the number of teachers individually mentioned is very great, particularly in the third book—among them are two Śākalyas, a Krishna Harita, a Pañchālachanda—and this may be considered as an additional proof of its more recent origin, a conclusion already implied by the spirit and form of the opinions enunciated.²⁵

The KaushītakiĀraṇyaka, in its present form, consists of three books, but it is uncertain whether it is complete.²⁷ It was only recently that I lighted upon the two first books.* These deal rather with ritual than with speculation. The third book is the so-called *Kaushītaki-Upanishad*,† a work of the highest interest and importance. Its first *adhyaṃya* gives us an extremely important account of the ideas held with regard to the path to, and arrival in, the world of the blessed, the significance of which in relation to similar ideas of other races is not yet quite apparent, but it promises to prove very rich in information. The second *adhyaṃya* gives us in the ceremonies which it describes, amongst other things, a very pleasing picture of the warmth and tenderness of family ties at that period. The third *adhyaṃya* is of inestimable value in connection with the history and development of the epic myth, inasmuch as it represents Indra battling with the same powers of nature that Arjuna in the epic subdues as evil demons. Lastly, the fourth *adhyaṃya* contains the second recension of a legend which also appears, under a somewhat different

²⁵ The circumstances here emphasized may be used to support the very opposite view: indeed I have so represented it in the similar case of the Lāṭyāyana Sūtra (see below). This latter view now appears to me to have more in its favour.

²⁷ A manuscript sent to Berlin by Buhler (*MS. Or. fol. 630*) of the 'Śāikhāyana Āraṇyaka' (as it is there called) presents it in 15 *adhyaṃyas*; the first two correspond to Ait. Ār. I, v, *adhyaṃya* 3-6 are made up of the Kaush. Up. *adhyaṃya* 7-8 correspond to Ait. Ār. III *adhyaṃya*

9 gives the rivalry of the *śāstres* (like Satap. Br. 14. 9. 2).

* See Catalogue of the Berlin Skr. MSS. p. 19, n. 82.

† See *J. St.*, I, 392-420. It would be very desirable to know on what Poley's assertion is founded, "that the Kaushītaki Brāhmaṇa consists of nine *adhyaṃyas* the first, seventh, eighth and ninth of which form the Kaushītaki Brāhmaṇa Upanishad." I have not succeeded in finding any statement to this effect elsewhere. (See now Cowell's Preface, p. vii to his edition of the Kaush. Up. in the *Bibl. Ind.*)

form, in the *Āraṇyaka* of the White Yajus, the legend namely, of the instruction of a Brahman who is very wise in his own esteem, by a warrior called Ajatasatru, king of Kāśī. This Upanishad is also peculiarly rich in geographical data, throwing light upon its origin. Thus the name of Chitra Gaṅgyavānī, the wise king in the first *adhyāya* who instructs Aruṇi, clearly points to the Gāṅga. According to ii 10, the northern and southern mountains *i.e.*, Himavānt and Vindhya, enclose in the eyes of the author the whole of the known world, and the list of the neighbouring tribes in iv 1 perfectly accords with this. That, moreover, this Upanishad is exactly contemporaneous with the *Vrihad-Āraṇyaka* of the White Yajus is proved by the position of the names Aruṇi, Śvetaketu, Ajatasatru, Gargya Balaki, and by the identity of the legends about the latter. [See *I S.*, i. 392-420]

We have an interpretation of both *Āraṇyakas*, that is to say, of the second and third books of the *Aitareya-Āraṇyaka*, and of the third book of the *Kaushītaki-Āraṇyaka* in the commentary of Saṃkaracārya, a teacher who lived about the eighth century A.D.,³⁸ and who was of the highest importance for the Vedānta school. For not only did he interpret all the Vedic texts, that is all the Upanishads, upon which that school is founded he also commented on the Vedānta Sūtra itself, besides composing a number of smaller works with a view to elucidate and establish the Vedānta doctrine. His explanations, it is true, are often forced, from the fact of their having to accommodate themselves to the Vedānta system, still they are of high importance for us. Pupils of his Ānandajñāna, Ānandagiri, Ānandatīrtha, and others, in their turn composed glosses on his commentaries. Of most of these commentaries and glosses we are now in possession as they have been recently edited, together with their Upanishads, by Dr Roer, Secretary to the Asiatic Society of Bengal, in the *Bibliotheca Indica*, a periodical appearing under the auspices of that Society, and devoted exclusively

³⁸ Śaṃkara's date has no, unfortunately been more accurately determined as yet. He passes at the same time for a zealous adversary of the Buddhists and is therefore

called a Śaiva, or follower of Śiva. In his works, however, he appears as a worshipper of Viśṇu, whom he puts forward as the real incarnation or representative of Brahman.

to the publication of texts. Unfortunately the Kaushī-tak-Upanishad is not yet among the number: neither is the Maitrayani-Upanishad, of which we have to speak in the sequel. It is, however, to be hoped that we shall yet receive both.³²—And may yet a third, the Vashkala-Upanishad, be recovered and added to the list of these Upanishads of the Rik! It is at present only known to us through Anquetil Duperron's *Oupnekhat*, II. 366-371, the original must therefore have been extant at the time of the Persian translation (rendered into Latin by Anquetil) of the principal Upanishads (1656). The Vashkala-Śruti is repeatedly mentioned by Sayana. We have seen above that a particular recension of the Rik-Samhita, which has likewise been lost, is attributed to the Vashkalas. This Upanishad is therefore the one sorry relic left to us of an extensive cycle of literature. It rests upon a legend repeatedly mentioned in the Brāhmanas, which in substance, and one might almost say in name also, corresponds to the Greek legend of Ganymedes. Medhatithi, the son of Kanva is carried up to heaven by Indra, who has assumed the form of a ram, and during their flight he inquires of Indra who he is. Indra, in reply, smilingly declares himself to be the All-god, identifying himself with the universe. As to the cause of the abduction, he goes on to say that, delighted with Medhatithi's penance, he desired to conduct him into the right path leading to truth, he must therefore have no further misgiving. With regard to the date of this Upanishad nothing more definite can of course at present be said than that its general tenor points to a tolerably high antiquity.³³

We now descend to the last stage in the literature of the R̥gveda viz. to its *Sūtras*.

First, of the *Śrānta-Sūtras*, or text-books of the sacrificial rite. Of these we possess two, the Sūtra of Āśvalayana in 12 *adhyāyas*, and that of Sankhayana in 18

³² Both have now been published and translated by Cowell in the *Bibliotheca Indica*. The Kaushī Up. (Calc. 1861) is accompanied with the comment of Samkarasāra, the

Maitrī Up. with that of Rāmātritha (1853-62).

³³ See now my special paper on the subject in *J. St.*, ix. 33-42. The original text has not yet been met with.

adhyayas The former connects itself with the Aitareya-Brahmana the latter with the Saṅkhayana Brahmana, and from these two works frequent literal quotations are respectively borrowed. From this circumstance alone as well as from the general handling of the subject, we might infer that these Sūtras are of comparatively recent origin, and direct testimony is not wanting to establish the fact. Thus the name Āśvalayana is probably to be traced back to Āśvala, whom we find mentioned in the Āranyaka of the White Yajus as the Hotar of Janaka, king of Videha (see *J St.*, i 441). Again, the formation of the word by the affix *āyana*,* probably leads us to the time of established schools (*ayana*)? However this may be, names formed in this way occur but seldom in the Brahmanas themselves, and only in their latest portions, in general, therefore they always betoken a late period. We find corroboration of this in the data supplied by the contents of the Āśvalayana-Sūtra. Among the teachers there quoted is an Āśmarathya, whose *kalpa* (doctrine) is considered by the scholiast on Panini, iv 3 105 probably following the Mahabhashya,¹ as belonging to the new *kalpas* implied in this rule, in contradistinction to the old *kalpas*. If, then, the authorities quoted by Āśvalayana were regarded as recent, Āśvalayana himself must of course have been still more modern, and therefore we conclude, assuming this statement to originate from the Mahabhashya,² that Āśvalāyana was nearly contemporaneous with Panini. Another teacher quoted by Āśvalayana, Tauliāli, is expressly mentioned by Panini (ii 4 61) as belonging to the *prāñichas*, or "dwellers in the east"—At the end there is a specially interesting enumeration of the various Brāhmaṇa-families, and their distribution among the family stems of Bhrigu, Aṅgiras, Atri, Viśvamitra, Kaśyapa, Vasiṣṭha and Agastya.—The sacrifices on the Sarasvatī, of which I shall treat in the sequel are here only briefly touched upon and this with some differences in the

* As in the case of Āgneyāyana, Ālambāyana, Āitāyana, Āudumbarāyana, Kāṇḍamāyana, Kātrāyana, Kbhāyana, Dāśyāyana, Pīṭhāyana, Bhārāyana, Māṇḍukāyana, Rāmāyana, Lāyāyana, Lābāyana.

(¹) Lāmāyana, Vārhyāyana, Śāatīyana, Śāṅkhīyana, Śāṭvāyana, Śāṇḍīyana, Śālamkāyana, Śāitryāyana, Śāulvāyana &c.

(²) The name is not known in the Mahabhashya, see *J St.* iii. 435.

names, which may well be considered as later corruptions. We have also already seen that Āśvalayana is the author of the fourth book of the Āitareya-Āraṇyaka, as also that he was the pupil of Saunaka, who is stated to have destroyed his own Sūtra in favour of his pupil's work.

The Sūtra of Sāṅkhayana wears in general a somewhat more ancient aspect, particularly in the fifteenth and sixteenth books, where it assumes the appearance of a Brahmana. The seventeenth and eighteenth books are a later addition, and are also ranked independently, and separately commented upon. They correspond to the first two books of the Kausītaki-Āraṇyaka.

From my but superficial acquaintance with them, I am not at present in a position to give more detailed information as to the contents and mutual relation of these two Sūtras.⁴² My conjecture would be that their differences may rest upon local grounds also, and that the Sūtra of Āśvalayana, as well as the Āitareya-Brahmana may belong to the eastern part of Hindustan, the Sūtra of Sāṅkhayana, or the contrary, like his Brahmana, rather to the western.* The order of the ceremonial is pretty much the same in both, though the great sacrifices of the kings &c, viz, *śāyapeya* (sacrifice for the prospering of the means of subsistence), *śāyasūya* (consecration of the king) *astamedha* (horse sacrifice), *puruṣamedha* (human sacrifice), *sarvamedha* (universal sacrifice), are handled by Sāṅkhayana with far more minuteness.

For Āśvalayana I find mention made of a commentary by Narayana⁴³ the son of Kṛṣṇapīṭh, a grandson of Śrīpati. A namesake of his, but son of Paśupatiśaśman,

⁴² The Āśvalīyana Sūtra has since been printed, *Bibl Ind* (Calc 1864-74) accompanied with the comment of Nārāyaṇa Gīrgya, edited by Rāma Nārāyaṇa and Anandachandra. A special comparison of it with the Sāṅkhayana Sūtra is still wanting. Buhler, *Catalogue of MSS from Gujarat* : 154 (1871) cites a commentary by Devatāśila on the Āśv Ś- S likewise a partial one by Viḍjāranya.

* Perhaps to the Naimisha forest (?) See below, p 59.

⁴³ This is a confusion. The above-named Nārāyaṇa wrote a commentary upon the Sāṅkhayana Gṛhya, but the one who commented the Āśvalīyana Śraut. Sūtra calls himself in the introduction a son of Naraśinha just as Nārāyaṇa the commentator of the Uṭṭara Naiśhadhīya, does, who, according to tradition (Pocr Pref p viii, 1855), lived some five hundred years ago. Are these two to be regarded as one and the same person? See *J Str*, 2, 298 (1869).

composed a *paddhati* ('outlines') to Sāṅkhayana, after the example of one Brahmadatta. When he lived is uncertain but we may with some probability assign him to the sixteenth century. According to his own statements he was a native of Malayadesa. Further, for the Sutra of Sāṅkhayana we have the commentary of Varadattasūta Anarītiya. Three of its *adhyāyas* were lost, and have been supplied by Dasasārman Muñjasunu, viz., the ninth, tenth and eleventh.* On the last two *adhyāyas*, xvii, xviii, there is a commentary by Govinda. That these commentaries were preceded by others, which, however, have since been lost, is obvious, and is besides expressly stated by Anarītiya.

Of the *Grihya Sūtray* of the Rīgveda we likewise only possess two, those of Āśvalayana (in four *adhyāyas*) and of Sāṅkhayana (in six *adhyāyas*). That of Śaunaka is indeed repeatedly mentioned, but it does not seem to be any longer in existence.

However widely they may differ as to details, the contents of the two works are essentially identical, especially as regards the order and distribution of the matter. They treat mainly, as I have already stated (p. 17) of the ceremonies to be performed in the various stages of conjugal and family life, before and after a birth, at marriage, at the time of and after a death. Besides these however, manners and customs of the most diverse character are depicted, and 'in particular, the sayings and formulas to be uttered on different occasions bear the impress of a very high antiquity, and frequently carry us back into the time when Brahminism had not yet been developed' (see Stenzler in *I St.*, ii 159). It is principally popular and superstitious notions that are found in them, thus, we are pointed to star-worship, to astrology, portents, and witchcraft, and more especially to the adoration and propitiation of the evil powers in nature, the averting of their malign influence, &c. It is especially in the *pīṣṭitarpana* or oblation to the Manes that we find a decisive proof of

* Sections 3-5 of the fourth book have been published by Donner in his *Pindavergewand* (Berlin, 1870), and the rest on relating to the legend of Saunaka (xi. 17-27) by

Stenzler (1851), the variants presented therein to the parallel passage in the *Āit. Brāhmaṇa* had already been given by M. Müller *A. S. L.* p. 573 ff.

the modern composition of these works, as the forefathers are there enumerated individually by name—a custom which, although in itself it may be very ancient (as we find a perfect analogy to it in the Yeshts and Nerengs of the Parsis), yet in this particular application belongs to a very recent period, as is apparent from the names themselves. For not only are the Rishis of the Rik-Samhita cited in their extant order, but all those names are likewise mentioned which we encounter as particularly significant in the formation of the different schools of the Rik, as well as in connection with its Brahmanes and Sūtras, for example, Vāhlala, Śakalya, Mandukeya, Āitareya, Pāṅgya, Keushitaka, Saunaka, Āśvalayana, and Śaṅkhayana themselves, &c. Joined to these, we find other names with which we are not yet otherwise acquainted, as also the names of three female sages, one of whom Gārgī Vachaknavī, meets us repeatedly in the Vrihad-Aranyaka of the White Yajus, as residing at the court of Janaka. The second⁴⁵ is unknown, but the name of the third, Sulabhā Maitreyī, is both connected with this very Janaka in the legends of the Mahā-Bharata,* and also points us to the *Sa'labhā. Brāhmanāni*, quoted by the echolast on Panini, iv 3 105, probably on the authority of the Mahabhāshya,⁴⁶ as an instance of the 'modern Brahmanes' implied by this rule. Immediately after the Rishis of the Rik-Samhita, we find mention of other names and works which have not yet been met with in any other part of Vedic literature. In the Śaṅkhayana-Grihya we have these *Sumanta-Jaimini-Vaisampāyana-Paula-sūtra-bhāṣya* [-Gārgya-Baoh-ā], and in the Āśvalayana-Grihya these *Sumanta-Jaimini-Vaisampāyana-Paula-dīpa-bhārata-mandbhārata-dīpānācharya*, &c.⁴⁷ The latter

⁴⁵ Her name is Vadhā Prāthī, they! a teacher called Pra (this is mentioned in the Yajus Brāhmana of the Śāmaveda).

⁴⁶ [Cf. Śaṅkara's statements as to this in Ved. Sūtrabhāṣya iii 3 32 p. 915 ed. Rāma Nārāyaṇa.] Bodhiśā's uncle is called by the Budhisā Śulabhā, see Schiefner *Leben des Śākyamuni* p. 6.

⁴⁷ See on this *J. St.* x: 429.

They are there cited a second time also, to Pāṇi. iv 2 68, and are explained by Kaivya as *Sulabhiṇa prokṣita*.

⁴⁷ The word *bhāṣya* is to be inserted above between *sūtra* and *bhāṣya*, though wanting in the MS used by me at the time when I wrote it; it is found in all the other MSS.

passage is evidently the more modern and although we must not suppose that the Maha-Bharata in its present form is here referred to, still, in the expression *Vaisampayano mahabhārataśācharyah* apparently indicated by this passage, there must at all events be implied a work of some compass, treating of the same legend, and therefore forming the basis of our extant text. The passage seems also to indicate that the same material had already been handled a second time by Jaimini, whose work however, can have borne but a distant resemblance to the Jaimini-Bharata of the present day. We shall find in the sequel frequent confirmation of the fact that the origin of the epic and the systematic development of Vedic literature in its different schools belong to the same period. Of a Sutra by Sumantu, and a Dharma by Paila, we have no knowledge whatever. It is only in more modern times in the Puranas and in the legal literature proper, that I find a work attributed to Sumantu, namely, a Smṛiti-Sāstra, while to Paila (whose name appears from Pan IV 1 118) is ascribed the revelation of the R̥gveda—a circumstance which at least justifies the inference that he played a special part in the definitive completion of its school development—It is, however, possible to give a wholly different interpretation of the passage from Aśvalīyana, and in my opinion it would be preferable to do so. We may divest the four proper names of any special relation to the names of the four works and regard the two groups as independent,⁴² as we must evidently assume them to be in the Sāṅkhya Upaniṣad*. If this be done then what most readily suggests itself in connection with the passage is the manner in which the Puranas apportion

* This interpretation becomes imperative after the rectification of the text (see the previous note), according to which no longer four but five names of works are in question.

* What is meant in the latter [and of note 47 in the Afr. Grh. too] by the word *śāśhīya*, appears from the Pratiśāhya of the White Yajur where (1 1 10 20) *śāśhīya* and *śāśhīya** are found in contradic-

tion to one another, just as in the Pratiśāhya of the Black Yajur (II. 12) we find *śāśhīya* and *śāśhīya* and in Yajur *śāśhīya* and *śāśhīya*. We must, therefore, understand by it works in *śāśhīya* though the meaning of the word is here more developed than in the works just mentioned and approaches the sense in which I am interested in. I shall return to the subject further on.

the revelation of the several Vedas, inasmuch as they assign the Atharvaveda to Sumantu, the Samaveda to Jaimini, the Yajurveda to Vaiśampayana, and the Rigveda to Paila. But in either case we must assume with Roth, who first pointed out the passage in Āśvalayana (*op. cit.*, p. 27) that this passage, as well as the one in Sankhayana, has been touched up by later interpolation,⁴² otherwise the dates of these two Grihya-Sūtras would be brought down too far! For although, from the whole tenor of both passages that in the Āśvalayana-Grihya, as well as that in the Sankhayana Grihya—which for the rest present other material discrepancies of detail—it is sufficiently clear that they presuppose the literature of the Rigveda as entirely closed, still the general attitude of both works shows their comparatively ancient origin—The question whether any connection exists between the Smṛti-Śāstra of Sāṅkha and the Grihya Sūtra of Śāṅkhayana, remains still unanswered.

For both Grihya-Sūtras there are commentaries by the same Narayana who commented the Śrauta-Sūtra of Āśvalayana⁴³. They probably belong to the fifteenth century*. There are, besides, as in the case of the Śrauta-Sūtras,

⁴² We find the Sumantu Jaimini Vaiśampayana Pailadya etc. etc. quoted a second time in the Śāṅkh G. in its last section (vi. 6), which is probably of later origin, and here without any doubt the reference is to the same distribution of the four Vedas among the above named persons which occurs in the Vishnu Purāṇa, iii. 4. 8. 9. Both times the representative of the Atharva comes first, that of the Rig last, which in a Rik text serves as a clear proof that we have here to do with later appendages. A similar precedence is given to the Atharvaveda in the Mahābhārata, cf. I. 2. 201. 431.

⁴³ This is a mistake, see note 43. All three Nārāyaṇas must be kept distinct. The commentator of the Āśval Śr. S. calls himself a *Qirya* and son of Narasimha, the commentator of the Āśval Grihya a Nārāyaṇa, and son of Divakara, the

commentator of the Śāṅkh Grihya, son of Kṛṣṇajit, and grandson of Śrīpati. (This third Nār lived A. D. 1538, see Catalogue of the Berlin MSS., p. 354, sub no. 1232).—The text of the Āśval Grihya has been edited by Stenzler with a translation (*Indische Hausregeln*, 1864-65), the text with Nārāyaṇa's comment, by Rāmanārāyaṇa and Anandachandra in *Bibl. Ind.* (1866-69). The sections relating to marriage ceremonies have been edited by Haas, *J. St.*, v. 283, ff. those relating to funeral rites, by Müller, *Z. D. M. G.* ix.

* Two glosses on Saṅkhara's commentary on the Prasnopanishad and the Mundakopanishad bear the same name so that possibly the author of them is identical with the above named Nārāyaṇa. According to what has just been remarked in note 50, this must appear a priori very doubtful, since a considerable number of other

many small treatises in connection with the Grihya-Sūtras, some of them being summaries, in which the larger works are reduced to system. Among them is a Paddhati to the Śaṅkhayana-Grihya by Ramachandra who lived in the Naimisha forest in the middle of the fifteenth century, and I am inclined to think that this Naimisha forest was the birthplace of the Sutra itself. It is perhaps for this reason that the tradition connected with it was so well preserved in that district.

The extant *Prātisākhya-Sutra* of the Rik Samhita is ascribed to Śaunaka, who has been repeatedly mentioned already, and who was the teacher of Āśvalayana. This extensive work is a metrical composition, divided into three *kāṇḍas*, of six *patalas* each, and containing 103 *landikās* in all. The first information regarding it was given by Roth, *op. cit.* p. 53 ff. According to tradition, it is of more ancient origin than the Sūtras of Āśvalayana just mentioned, which only purport to be written by the pupil of this Śaunaka, but whether it really was composed by the latter, or whether it is not much more probably merely the work of his school must for the present remain undecided. The names quoted in it are in part identical with those met with in Yaska's Nirukti and in the Sūtra of Pāṇini. The contents of the work itself are however as yet but little known⁵¹ in their details. Of special interest are those passages which treat of the correct and incorrect pronunciation of words in general. There is an excellent commentary on it by Uata, which professes in the introduction to be a remodelling of an earlier commentary by Vishnuputra.—The *Upalekha* is to be con-

authors bear the same name. But in this particular case we are able to bring forward definite reasons against this identification. The glossarist of the Prāśnop was called Vidyānanda according to *I St.*, l. 470, according to the note *ibid.* l. 439, Vargya Sarasvati according to Aufrecht Catalogue of the Oxford MSS. p. 366 (1859-64), rather Rajanendrasarasvati (!). The glossarist of the Mundikop, on the other hand was, according to *I St.*, l. 470 called Vidyānabhaṭṭa and

he is probably identical with the author of the dipika on the small Atharvopaniṣads published in the *Beibl.* Ind. in 1872 who (*ibid.*, p. 303) is called Bhagga Nīrdyana and son of Bhagga Ratnakara.]

⁵¹ We are now in possession of two editions of this most important work: text and translation with elucidatory notes by Ad. Reznier (Paris 1857-58) and M. Müller (Leipzig 1856-69); see *I St.* II 94 ff., 127 ff., 159 ff., *Lit. Centralblatt*, 1870 p. 530.

sidered as an epitome of the Pratisakhya-Sûtra, and to some extent as a supplement to it [specially to chapters x xl.] It is a short treatise, numbered among the Parîśishtas (supplements), and it has in its turn been repeatedly commented upon.⁵²

A few other treatises have still to be noticed here, which, although they bear the high sounding name of *Vedāṅgas*, or 'members of the Veda,' are yet, as above stated (p. 25), only to be looked upon as later supplements to the literature of the Rigveda the *Śikshā*, the *Chhandas*, and the *Jyotiṣa*. All three exist in a double recension according as they profess to belong to the Rigveda or to the Yajurveda. The Chhandas is essentially alike in both recensions, and we have to recognise in it the Sutra on prosody ascribed to Piṅgala.⁵³ It is, moreover, like both the other treatises, of very recent origin. We have a proof of this, for instance, in the fact that, in the manner peculiar to the Indians it expresses numbers by words,⁵⁴ and feet by letters, and that it treats of the highly elaborated metres, which are only found in modern poetry.⁵⁵ The part dealing with Vedic metres may perhaps be more ancient. The teachers quoted in it bear in part comparatively ancient

⁵² Edited by W. Pertsch (Berlin, 1854), this tract treats of the *krana yāna*, an extended form of the *paḍapāṇi* which at the same time gives the text in the *simhātā* form, namely each word twice first joined with the preceding and then with the following word (thus *ab, bc, cd, de* &c.). There are also other still more complicated modes of reciting the Veda, as to which cf. Thibaut in his edition of the *Jatāpata*'s (1870) p. 36 ff. The next sūp., called *yāna* exhibits the text in the following manner: *ab ba ab bc bc bc and MSS.* of this kind have actually been preserved, e.g., in the case of the *Vājasaneyi*. The following sūp. called *ghoṣa* is said to be still in use of Baudhārya *Indian Anecdotes* in 133. Haug *Über das Wesen des vedischen Accents* p. 58. *krana ab ba abc cba ab, bc cd bc led dcd bcd.*

⁵³ Edited and commented by myself in *I St viii* (1863), the text together with the commentary of Haldyudha, edited by Viśvanātha-śāstrin in *Bibl. Indica* (1871-74).

⁵⁴ See Aldrich's account in *Wernicke's Mémoire sur la prosodie des chiffres indiens*, p. 102, ff. (1803). Burnell, *Review of S. I. Palæogr.*, p. 58.

⁵⁵ On the other hand, there are metres taught in this work which but rarely occur in modern literature and which must be looked upon as obsolete and out of fashion. Therefore in spite of what has been said above we must carry back the date of its composition to a period about simultaneous with the close of the Vedic Sūtra literature, or the commencement of the astronomical and algebraical literatures, see *LSA*, viii. 173, 178.

names These are Kraushtuki, Tandin Yaska, Saitava Rata and Mandavya. The recensions most at variance with each other are those of the Śiksha and Jyotisha respectively. The former work is in both recensions directly traced to Panini, the latter to Lagadha, or Lagana, an otherwise unknown name in Indian literature *—Besides the Pāṇinīya Śiksha, there is another bearing the name of the Mandūkas, which therefore may more directly follow the Rik, and which is at any rate a more important work than the former. As a proof of the antiquity of the name 'Śiksha' for phonetic investigations, we may adduce the circumstance that in the Teitt Āraṇy vii. 1, we find a section beginning thus "we will explain the Śiksha, whereupon it gives the titles of the topics of the oral exposition which we may suppose to have been connected therewith (*I St.*, ii. 211), and which, to judge by these titles must have embraced letters accents quantity, articulation, and the rules of euphony, that is to say the same subjects discussed in the two existing Śikshas⁶⁵.

Of the writings called *Anukramani*, in which the metre, the deity, and the author of each song are given in their proper order, several have come down to us for the Rik Samhitā, including an *Anurākhānukramanī* by Śaunaka, and a *Sarānukramanī* by Katyayana.⁶⁷ For both of these we have an excellent commentary by Shadguru-

* Renaud in his *Mémoire sur l'Inde* pp. 331-332, adduces from Albruni a Lāta, who passed for the author of the old Sūrya Siddhānta, might be not be identical with the Lagadha Lagana? According to Colebr. *Fas.* ii. 409 Brahmagupta quotes a Lādhachārya this name also could be traced to Lagadha. [By Suryadeva a scholiast of Arya bhāṣa the author of the Jyotisha is cited under the name of Lagadī chārya see Kuru Preface to the Aryabhatīya, p. ix. 1874. An edition of the text of the Jyotisha, together with extracts from Somā kara's commentary and explanatory notes was published by me in 1862 under the title *Ueber den Verfallender Namens Jyotisha*.]

⁶⁵ The Pāṇinīya Śikshā has been printed with a translation in *I St.* iv. 345-371 (1858), on the numerous other treatises bearing the same name, see Rāyendra Lāla Mitra, *Notice of Sanskrit MSS.* i. 71 ff. (1870) Burnell, *Catalogue of Vedic MSS.*, pp. 8-42 (1870) my essay on the Prajñakātra (1872) pp. 70-74 especially on the Māndūkī Śiksha pp. 106-112 Haug *Ueber das Wesen des vedischen Accents* p. 53 ff. (1873) on the Nārada Śikshā, *ibid.* 57 ff. and lastly Kielhorn *I St.* xiv. 160.

⁶⁷ In substance published by Müller in the sixth volume of his large edition of the Rik, pp. 621-671.

ably altered by the prolongation and repetition of the syllables, by the insertion of additional syllables serving as a rest for the chanting, and so forth, and only thus were they transformed into *sáman*s. Two of these song-books, the *Grámagā-gāna* (erroneously called *Vēyagāna*), in seventeen *prapāthakas*, and the *Aranya-gāna*, in six *prapāthakas*, follow the order of the *richas* contained in the first part of the Samhita, the former being intended for chanting in the *grāmas*, or inhabited places, the latter for chanting in the forest. Their order is fixed in a comparatively very ancient Anukramanī, which even bears the name of Brahmana, viz., *Rishi-Brāhmaṇa*. The other two *gānas*, the *Uha-gāna*, in twenty-three *prapāthakas*, and the *Ūhya-gāna*, in six *prapāthakas*, follow the order of the *richas* contained in the second part of the Samhita. Their mutual relation here still requires closer investigation. Each such *sáman* evolved out of a *rich* has a special technical name, which probably in most cases originated from the first inventor of the form in question, is often, however, borrowed from other considerations, and is usually placed in the manuscripts before the text itself. As each *rich* can be chanted in a great variety of ways, in each of which it bears a particular name, the number of *sáman*s, strictly speaking, is quite unlimited, and is of course far greater than that of the *richas* contained in the Samhita. Of these latter there are 1549,* of which all but seventy-eight have been traced in the Rik-Samhita. Most of them are taken from its eighth and ninth *mandalas*.

I have already remarked (p. 9) upon the antiquity of the readings of the Sama Samhita as compared with those of the Rik-Samhita. It follows from this almost with

* Bentley [*Einleitung*, p. xix.] erroneously states the number as 1472, which I copied from him *I St.* 1. 29. 30. The above number is borrowed from a paper by Whitney, which will probably find a place in the *Indische Studien*. The total number of the *richas* contained in the Sama Samhita is 1810 (585 in the first, 1225 in the second part), from which, however, 261 are to be deducted as mere repetitions, i.e.,

much as 249 of those occurring in the first part are repeated in the second, three of their twice, while nine of the *richas* which occur in the second part only appear twice [See on this Whitney's detailed table at the end of his *Tabelle der gegenseitigen Verhältnisse der Samhitas des Rik, Saman, Yajus und Atharvan I St.*, p. 321, ff., 363 (1853)].

certainly that the *richas* constituting the former were borrowed from the songs of the latter at a remote period, before their formation into a Rik Samhita had as yet taken place, so that in the interval they suffered a good deal of wearing down in the mouth of the people, which was avoided in the case of the *richas* applied as *sāmans*, and so protected by being used in worship. The fact has also already been stated that no verses have been received into the Sama-Samhita from those songs of the Rik-Samhita which must be considered as the most modern. Thus we find no *sāmans* borrowed from the Purusha-Sūkta, in the ordinary recensions at least, for the school of the Nageyas has, in fact, incorporated the first five verses of it into the seventh *prapāthaka* of the first part—a section which is peculiar to this school. The Sama-Samhita, being a purely derivative production, gives us no clue towards the determination of its date. It has come down to us in two recensions, on the whole differing but little from each other, one of which belongs to the school of the Ranayanīyas, the other to that of the Kauthumas. Of this latter the school of the Negas, or Nageyas, alluded to above, is a subdivision, of which two Anukramanīs at least, one of the deities and one of the Rishis of the several verses, have been preserved to us⁶⁰. Not one of these three names has as yet been traced in Vedic literature, it is only in the Sūtras of the Samaveda itself that the first and second at least are mentioned, but even here the name of the Negas does not appear.—The text of the Ranayanīyas was edited and translated, with strict reference to Sayana's commentary, by the missionary Stevenson in 1842, since 1848 we have been in possession of another edition, furnished with a complete glossary and much

⁶⁰ The seventh *prapāthaka*, which is peculiar to it has since been discovered. It bears the title Aranyaka Samhitā, and has been edited by Siegfried Goldschmidt in *Monatsberichte der Berl Acad* 1868, pp 228-248. The editor points out that the Aranya-gāna is based upon the *archika* of the Nageya text (*l c*, p 238) and that MSS have probably been preserved of its *utāradrchika* also (p 241).—A London MS of Bharatavāsin's Samavedavivarana

especially refers to the Aranyaka Samhitā, see Burnell, *Catalogue of Vedic MSS* (1870) p 39.—Of the Aranyaka gāna as well as of the Gramageya gāna we find *ibid* p 49, a text in the Jaimini Śākhā also. According to Rajendra Lal Mitra (Preface to Translation of Chhând Up, p 4) 'the kauthuma (-Śākhā) is current in Guzerat, the Jaiminiya in Karnātaka and the Rānāyāniya in Maharāshtra.

but in any case it would be a mistake to suppose that for all the different sacrifices enumerated in the Brahmana corresponding prayers exist in the Samhita. On the contrary, the latter probably only exhibits the verses to be chanted generally at all the Soma sacrifices, and the Brahmana must be regarded as the supplement in which the modifications for the separate sacrifices are given, and also for those which arose later. While, as we saw above (p. 14), a combination of verses of the Rik for the purpose of recitation bears the name *śāstra*, a similar selection of different *sāmans* united into a whole is usually called *ultha* (*√ iach*, to speak), *stoma* (*√ stu*, to praise), or *prishtha* (*√ prachh*, to ask), and these in their turn, like the *śāstras*, receive different appellations.⁶³

Of special significance for the time of the composition of the Tandyā Brahmana are, on the one hand, the very minute descriptions of the sacrifices on the Sarasvatī and Drishadvatī, and, on the other, the Vratyastomas, or sacrifices by which Indians of Aryan origin, but not living according to the Brahmanical system, obtained admission to the Brahman community. The accounts of these latter sacrifices are preceded by a description of the dress and mode of life of those who are to offer them. "They drive in open chariots of war, carry bows and lances, wear turbans, robes bordered with red and having fluttering ends, shoes, and sheepskins folded double, their leaders are distinguished by brown robes and silver neck-ornaments, they pursue neither agriculture nor commerce, their laws are in a constant state of confusion, they speak the same language as those who have received Brahmanical consecration, but nevertheless call what is easily spoken hard to pronounce." This last statement probably refers to

⁶³ The term directly opposed to *śāstra* is rather *stoma*. *Prishtha* specially designates several *stomas* belonging to the mid day sacrifice, and forming, as it is expressed, its "back," *ultha* is originally employed as a synonym of *śāstra* and only at a later period in the meaning of *sāman* (*I St*, xiii 447). *Stoma*, lastly is the name for the six seven, or more ground forms of the *sāmans* after which these latter are formed for the purpose of chanting

The simple recitation of the *śāstras* by the Hotar and his companions always comes after the chanting recitation of the same verses by the Udātār and his assistants (*grādyā grādyā s'vate śā sansati* *Sat* viii 1 3 3). The differences of the seven *samsthās*, or fundamental types of the Soma sacrifice rest mainly upon the varying number of the *śāstras* and *stomas* belonging to their *sūctā* days. See *I St*, i 353 ff., ix. 229.

prākritic, dialectic differences, to the assimilation of groups of consonants, and similar changes peculiar to the Prākrit vernaculars. The great sacrifice of the Naumushya Rishi is also mentioned, and the river Sudaman. Although we have to conclude from these statements that communication with the west, particularly with the non-Brahmanic Aryans there, was still very active and that therefore the locality of the composition must be laid more towards the west,⁶⁴ still data are not wanting which point us to the east. Thus, there is mention of Para Átnara, king of the Kosalas, of Trasadasyu Purukutsa, who is also named in the Rik-Samhita, further of Namin Sapyā, king of the Videhas (the Nimi of the epic), of Kurukshetra, Yamuna &c. The absence, however, of any allusion in the Tandya-Brahmana either to the Kuru-Pañchālas or to the names of their princes, as well as of any mention of Janaka, is best accounted for by supposing a difference of locality. Another possible, though less likely, explanation of the fact would be to assume that this work was contemporary with, or even anterior to, the flourishing epoch of the kingdom of the Kuru-Pañchālas. The other names quoted therein seem also to belong to an earlier age than those of the other Brāhmanas, and to be associated, rather, with the Rishi period. It is, moreover, a very significant fact that scarcely any differences of opinion are stated to exist amongst the various teachers. It is only against the Kaushītakis that the field is taken with some acrimony, they are denoted as *vrātyas* (apostates) and as *yajñdātāśūna* (unfit to sacrifice). Lastly, the name attached to this Brahmana,* viz. Tandya, is mentioned in the Brahmana of the White Yajus as that of a teacher, so that, combining all this, we may at least safely infer its priority to the latter work.⁶⁵

⁶⁴ The fact that the name of Chitraratha (*chitra va: Chitraratham Ad-
peya ayijayan tasmāch Chitrarathīndm ekah kshatrapatir jāyate
'nulanāda iva dūtīyah* xx. 12, 5) occurs in the *gana* 'Rājadanta' to Pān. ii. 2. 31, joined with the name Bṛhika in a compound (*Chitraratha Bṛhikam*), is perhaps also to be taken in this connection.

* The first use of this designation it is true, only occurs in Lāṭyāyana,

the other Sūtras invariably quoting it by 'atīśruteh'.

⁶⁵ The Tandya Brāhmana has been edited, together with Śāyana's commentary, in the *Bibl. Ind.* (1869-74) by Anandachandra Vedāntavāgīśa. At the time of the Bhāṣika Sūtra (see Kielhorn, *I. St.*, x. 421) it must still have been accentuated and that in the same manner as the Sātapatha, in Kuṇḍīlabhāṭṭa's time, on the contrary (the last half of the

The *Shadvīṅśa-Brahmana* by its very name proclaims itself a supplement to the *Pañchaviṅśa-Brahmana*. It forms, as it were, its twenty-sixth book, although itself consisting of several books. Sayana, when giving a summary of its contents at the commencement of his here excellent commentary, says that it both treats of such ceremonies as are not contained in the *Pañchaviṅśa-Brahmana*, and also gives points of divergence from the latter. It is chiefly expiatory sacrifices and ceremonies of imprecation that we find in it, as also short, comprehensive general rules. The fifth book (or sixth *adhyāya*) has quite a peculiar character of its own, and is also found as a separate *Brahmana* under the name of *Adbhuta-Brahmana*, in the latter form, however, with some additions at the end. It enumerates untoward occurrences of daily life, omens and portents, along with the rites to be performed to avert their evil consequences. These afford us a deep insight into the condition of civilisation of the period, which, as might have been expected, exhibits a very advanced phase. The ceremonies first given are those to be observed on the occurrence of vexatious events generally, then come those for cases of sickness among men and cattle, of damaged crops, losses of precious things, &c., those to be performed in the event of earthquakes, of phenomena in the air and in the heavens, &c., of marvellous appearances on altars and on the images of the gods, of electric phenomena and the like, and of mis-carriages⁶⁶. This sort of superstition is elsewhere only treated of in the *Grihya-Sūtras*, or in the *Parīśiṣṭās* (supplements), and thus imparts to the last *adhyāya* of the *Shadvīṅśa-Brahmana*—as the remaining contents do to the work generally—the appearance of belonging to a very modern period. And, in accordance with this, we find mention here made of Uddalaka Āruṇi, and other teachers, whose names are altogether unknown to the *Pañchaviṅśa-Brahmana*—A *śloka* is cited in the course of

seventh century according to Burnell), it was already being handed down without accents, as in the present day. See Müller *A S L*, p. 348. Burnell, *Sāṃavedhāna Brāhmaṇa*, Preface, p. 11.

⁶⁶ The *Adbhuta Brāhmaṇa* has been published by myself, text with translation and explanatory notes, in *Zwei vedische Texte über Omina und Portenta* (1850).

the work, in which the four *yugas* are still designated by their more ancient names, and are connected with the four lunar phases, to which they evidently owe their origin, although all recollection of the fact had in later times died out⁶⁷ This *śloka* itself we are perhaps justified in assigning to an earlier time than that of Megasthenes, who informs us of a fabulous division of the mundane ages analogous to that given in the epic. But it does not by any means follow that the *Shadvinśa-Brahmana*, in which the *śloka* is quoted, itself dates earlier than the time of Megasthenes.

The third Brahmana of the Samaveda bears the special title of *Chhândogya-Brahmana*, although *Chhandogya* is the common name for all Saman theologians. We, however, also find it quoted, by Śaṅkara, in his commentary on the *Brahma-Sūtra*, as "*Tāndirān śruti*," that is to say, under the same name that is given to the *Pañchaviṃśa-Brahmana*. The two first *adhyāyās* of this Brahmana are still missing, and the last eight only are preserved, which also bear the special title of *Chhândogyopanishad*. This Brahmana is particularly distinguished by its rich store of legends regarding the gradual development of Brahmanical theology, and stands on much the same level as the *Vrihad-Āraṇyaka* of the White Yajus with respect to opinions, as well as date, place, and the individuals mentioned. The absence in the *Vrihad-Āraṇyaka*, as in the Brahmana of the White Yajus generally, of any reference to the *Naumīyā-Rishis*, might lead us to argue the priority of the *Chhândogyopanishad* to the *Vrihad-Āraṇyaka*. Still, the mention in the *Chhândogyopanishad* of these, as well as of the *Mahavrishas* and the *Gandharas*—the latter, it is true, are set down as distant—ought perhaps only to be taken as proof of a somewhat more western origin, whereas the *Vrihad-Āraṇyaka* belongs, as we shall hereafter see, to quite the eastern part of Hindustan. The numerous animal fables, on the contrary, and the mention of *Mahidaśa Antareya*, would sooner incline me to suppose that the *Chhândogyopanishad* is more modern than the *Vrihad-Āraṇyaka*. With regard to another allusion, in

⁶⁷ Differently Roth in his essay *Die Lehre von den vier Weltaltern* (Tubingen 1800)

itself of the greatest significance, it is more hazardous to venture a conjecture. I mean the mention of Krishna Devakiputra, who is instructed by Ghora Āṅgīrasa. The latter, and besides him (though not in connection with him) Krishna Āṅgīrasa, are also mentioned in the Kauśhītaki-Brahmana, and supposing this Krishna Āṅgīrasa to be identical with Krishna Devakiputra, the allusion to him might perhaps rather be considered as a sign of priority to the Vṛihad-Āraṇyaka. Still, assuming this identification to be correct, due weight must be given to the fact that the name has been altered here instead of Āṅgīrasa, he is called Devakiputra, a form of name for which we find no analogy in any other Vedic writing excepting the Vāṇśas (genealogical tables) of the Vṛihad-Araṇyaka, and which therefore belongs, at all events, to a tolerably late period.* The significance of this allusion for the understanding of the position of Krishna at a later period is obvious. Here he is yet but a scholar, eager in the pursuit of knowledge, belonging perhaps to the military caste. He certainly must have distinguished himself in some way or other, however little we know of it, otherwise his elevation to the rank of deity, brought about by external circumstances, would be inexplicable.⁶³

The fact of the Chhandoggyopaniṣad and the Vṛihad-Āraṇyaka having in common the names Pravahana Jai-
tali, Uśasti Chikrayana, Śandilya, Satyakama Jabala,
Uddalaka Āruṇi, Śvetaketu, and Āśvapati, makes it clear
that they were as nearly as possible contemporary works,
and this appears also from the generally complete identity
of the seventh book of the former with the corresponding
passages of the Vṛihad-Āraṇyaka. What, however, is of
most significance, as tending to establish a late date for

* Comp. also Pan. iv 1 150 and the names Samiṣṭapara, Rāṇi-
yaniputra in the Sāma Sāraṇ as
also Kṛitayana in the Śāṇḍilya-
putra Vāṇśas among the
Buddhists [On the etymology
of the name - I S., iii 157,
483, 480 - iv 350 - 353, 362, 64].

⁶³ By what means does the elevation of Krishna to the rank of deity was brought about as we observe, though unquestionably

mythical relations to Indra, &c. are at the root of it - see I S. xiii, 3, 9, ff. The whole question, however is still very vague. Krishna worship proper as the sectarian worship of Krishna as the one God, probably obtained its perfection through the influence of Christianity. See my paper, *Krishna's God, after* p. 316, ff. (where also are further particulars as to the name Devaki).

the Chhândogyopanishad, is the voluminous literature, the existence of which is presupposed by the enumeration at the beginning of the ninth book. Even supposing this ninth book to be a sort of supplement (the names of Sanat-kumara and Skanda are not found elsewhere in Vedic literature, Narada also is otherwise only mentioned in the second part of the Aitareya-Brâhmana⁶⁹), there still remains the mention of the 'Atharvaśgrasas,' as well as of the Itihasas and Puranas in the fifth book. Though we are not at liberty here any more than in the corresponding passages of the Vrihad-Āranyaka, to understand by these last the Itihasas and Puranas which have actually come down to us, still we must look upon them as the forerunners of these works, which, originating in the legends and traditions connected with the songs of the Rik, and with the forms of worship, gradually extended their range, and embraced other subjects also, whether drawn from real life, or of a mythical and legendary character. Originally they found a place in the Brahmanas, as well as in the other expository literature of the Vedas, but at the time of this passage of the Chhândogyopanishad they had possibly already in part attained an independent form, although the commentaries,* as a rule, only refer such expressions to passages in the Brahmanas themselves. The Mahâ-Bharata contains, especially in the first book, a few such Itihâsas, still in a prose form, nevertheless, even these fragments so preserved to us belong, in respect both of style and of the conceptions they embody, to a much later period than the similar passages of the Brahmanas. They however suffice, together with the *ślokas*, *gâthâs*, &c. quoted in the Brahmanas themselves, and with such works as the Barhadâivata, to bridge over for us the period of transition from legend to epic poetry.

We meet, moreover, in the Chhândogyopanishad with one of those legal cases which are so seldom mentioned in Vedic literature, viz., the infliction of capital punishment for (denied) theft, exactly corresponding to the severe

⁶⁹ And a few times in the Atharva-Saṃhitâ, as also in the Vâgas of the Sâmavedhîna Brâhmaṇa.

* Not Śaṅkara, it is true, in the

case but Sâyaṇa, Harivarṇan, and Drivedagaṇḍa in similar passages of the Śaṅkara Brâhmaṇa and Taittirîya-Āranyaka.

enactments regarding it in Manu's code. Guilt or innocence is determined by an ordeal, the carrying of a red-hot axe, this also is analogous to the decrees in Manu. We find yet another connecting link with the state of culture in Manu's time in a passage occurring also in the *Vṛihad-Āraṇyaka*, viz, the doctrine of the transmigration of souls. We here meet with this doctrine for the first time, and that in a tolerably complete form, in itself, however, it must certainly be regarded as much more ancient. The circumstance that the myth of the creation in the fifth book is on the whole identical with that found at the beginning of Manu, is perhaps to be explained by regarding the latter as simply a direct imitation of the former. The tenth book, the subject of which is the soul, its seat in the body and its condition on leaving it, i.e., its migration to the realm of Brahman, contains much that is of interest in this respect in connection with the above-mentioned parallel passage of the *Kṛuṣṭakṛ-Īpāṇishad*, from which it differs in some particulars. Here also for the first time in the field of Vedic literature occurs the name *Rāhu*, which we may reckon among the proofs of the comparatively recent date of the *Chhandogyaopaniṣad*.

Of expressions for philosophical doctrines we find only *Īpāṇishad*, *Ādeśa*, *Guhya* *Ādeśa* (the keeping secret of doctrine is repeatedly and urgently inculcated), *Uṇḍhhyana* (explanation). The teacher is called *āchārya* [as he is also in the *Śat Br*], for "inhabited place," *ardha* is used, single *śloka*s and *gāthā*s are very often quoted.

The *Chhandogyaopaniṣad* has been edited by Dr Roer in the *Bibliotheca Indica*, vol. in., along with Samkhya's commentary and a gloss on it.⁷⁰ Fr Windischmann had previously given us several passages of it in the original, and several in translation, see also *I St*, 1. 254-273.

The *Kenopaniṣad* has come down to us as the remnant of a fourth Brahmana of the Samaveda, supposed to be its ninth book.* In the colophons and in the quotations found in the commentaries, it also bears the other-

⁷⁰ In this series (1854-62) a translation also has been published by Rājendra Lalā Mitra.

* Regarding the contents of the

first eight books Śaṅkara furnishes us with information in the beginning of his commentary.

wise unknown name of the *Taloraśāras** It is divided into two parts the first, composed in *ślokas*, treats of the being of the supreme Brahman, appealing in the fourth verse to the tradition of the "earlier sages who have taught us this" as its authority The second part contains a legend in support of the supremacy of Brahmar, and here we find Uṃa Haimavatī, later the spouse of Śiva, acting as mediatrix between Brahman and the other gods, probably because she is imagined to be identical with Sarasvatī, or Vach, the goddess of speech, of the creative word †

These are the extant Brahmanas of the Samaveda. Sayana, indeed, in his commentary on the Samavidhān-enummerates eight (3-2 Muller, Rik. 1. Pref. p. xxvii) the *Prothya-* or *Manu-Brahmana* (i.e., the *Pañcharvīṣa*), the *Shāṭvina*, the *Sāmavedhī*, the *Ārsheya*, the *Devatādhyāya*, the *Upaniṣad*, the *Samhitopanishad*, and the *Vanśa*. The claims, however, of four of these works to the name of Brahmana, have no solid foundation. The *Ārsheya* is, as already stated, merely an Anukramanī, and the *Devatādhyāya* can hardly be said to be anything else, the *Vanśa* elsewhere always constitutes a part of the Brahmanas themselves the two latter works, moreover, can scarcely be supposed to be still in existence, which, as far as the *Vanśa* is concerned, is certainly very much to be regretted. The Samavidhāna also, which probably treats, like the portion of the *Litayana-Sūtra* bearing the same name, of the conversion of the *richas* into *śmans*, can hardly pass for a Brahmana⁷¹. As to the *Samhitopanishad*, it appears

* Might not this name be traceable to *neare* root *ṛ*, *ṛad*, from which *Tārḍya* is derived?

† On the literature of, or the *Kenopaniṣad*, see *J. St.* 1. 181 ff. [We have to add Poonēdi on *Wāṇī* Shankara's commentary - *Ēkāśaśāstra*, vol. vii, and *Litayana* *ibid.*, vol. x.]

⁷¹ The above statement requires to be corrected and supplemented in several particulars. 1. *Vanśa* Brahmana was first edited by Müller in *J. St.*, iv. 371, ff., afterwards by Burnell with Śāyana's commentary (1873). The *Devatādhyāya* is not

an Anukramanī, but only contains some information as to the duties of the different *śmans*, to which a few other short fragments are added. Finally, the *Sāmavedhī* Brahmana does not treat of the conversion of *richas* into *śmans*, on the contrary, it is a work similar to the *Pañcharvīṣa*, and relates to the employment of the *śmans* for all sorts of superstitious purposes. Both texts have hitherto been edited by Cartell, with Śāyana's commentary (1873). By Kāmēṛa, too, the number of the Brahmanas of the Samaveda is given as eight (Müller,

to me doubtful whether Sayana meant by it the Kenopanishad, for though the *samhitā* (universality) of the Supreme Being certainly is discussed in the latter, the subject is not handled under this name, as would seem to be demanded by the analogy of the title of the Samhitopanishad of the Antareya-Āraṇyaka as well as of the Taittiriya-Āraṇyaka. My conjecture would be that he is far more likely to have intended a work⁷² of the same title, of which there is a MS. in the British Museum (see *I St.*, 142), and if so, all mention of the Kenopanishad has been omitted by him, possibly for the reason that it appears at the same time in an Atharvan-recension (differing but little, it is true), and may have been regarded by him as belonging to the Atharvan?

There is a far greater number of *Sūtras* to the Sama Veda than to any of the other Vedas. We have here three Śrauta-Sūtras, a Sūtra which forms a running commentary upon the Pañchaviṃśa-Brahmana, five Sūtras on Metres and on the conversion of *richas* into *sāmans*, and a Gṛhya-Sūtra. To these must further be added other similar works of which the titles only are known to us, as well as a great mass of different *Parīśiṣṭas*.

Of the *Śrauta-Sūtras*, or Sūtras treating of the sacrificial ritual, the first is that of *Maśaka*, which is cited in the other Sama-Sūtras, and even by the teachers mentioned in these, sometimes as *Ārśheya Kalpa*, sometimes as *Kalpa*, and once also by Latvayana directly under the name of *Maśika*⁷³. In the colophons it bears the name of *Kalpa-Sūtra*. This Sūtra is but a tabular enumeration of the prayers belonging to the several ceremonies of the Soma sacrifice, and these are quoted partly by their technical Saman names, partly by their opening words. The

A S L., p. 348) in his time all of them were already without accents. One fact deserves to be specially noticed here, namely, that several of the teachers mentioned in the Vanda Brahmana by their very names, point us directly to the north-west of India, e.g., Kāmbaja, Auṣamanyava, Madragiri Śaungayana, Śaśi, Anātārākṣa Śūmukīyana, and Bahula. see *I St.*, iv 373-380.

⁷² This is unquestionably correct,

since this text appears there, as well as elsewhere, in connection with the Vanda Brahmana, &c. It is no much larger than the *Devatādhyāya* but has not yet been published, see *I St.* iv 375.

⁷³ Latvayana designates *Maśaka* as *Gārgya*. Is this name connected with the *Mācava* of the Greeks? Lassen, *I A H.*, i 130, *I St.*, iv 373.

order is exactly that of the Pañchaviñśa-Brahmana, yet a few other ceremonies are inserted, including those added in the Shadvinśa-Brahmana, as well as others. Among the latter the *Janakasaptarātra* deserves special notice, — a ceremony owing its origin to King Janaka,⁷⁴ of whom, as we saw above, no mention is yet made in the Pañchaviñśa-Brahmana. His life and notoriety therefore evidently fall in the interval between the latter work and the Sūtra of Maśaka — The eleven *prapāṭhalas* of this Sūtra are so distributed that the *ekāhas* (sacrifices of one day) are dealt with in the first five chapters, the *ahinas* (those lasting several days) in the following four, and the *sattras* (sacrifices lasting more than twelve days) in the last two. There is a commentary on it, composed by Varadaraja, whom we shall meet with again as the commentator of another Saina-Sūtra.

The second Srauta-Sūtra is that of *Lātyāyana*, which belongs to the school of the Kauthumas. This name appears to me to point to Lata the *Λατυκή* of Ptolemy,⁷⁵ to a country therefore lying quite in the west, directly south of Surāshtra (Συρασσηνή). This would agree perfectly with the conjecture above stated, that the Pañchaviñśa-Brahmana belongs more to the west of India, and is borne out by the data contained in the body of the Sūtra itself, as we shall see presently.

This Sūtra, like that of Maśaka, connects itself closely with the Pañchaviñśa-Brahmana, and indeed often quotes passages of some length from it, generally introducing them by '*tad u! lam brāhmanena*,' or, '*ut brāhmanam bhavati*,' once also by '*tathā purānam Tandam*.' It usually gives at the same time the different interpretations which these passages received from various teachers. Sandilya, Dhanamjaya, and Sandilyayana are most frequently mentioned in this manner, often together, or one after the other, as expounders of the Pañchaviñśa-Brahmana. The first named is already known to us through the Chhandogyanishad, and he, as well as Sandilyayana, is repeatedly

⁷⁴ Sāyana, it is true to Pañch
xu 9 1 takes *janaka* as an ap
pellative in the sense of *prapāṭha*,
which is the reading of the Pañcha
v.2's Brahmana.

⁷⁵ Lātika as early as the edicts of
Piyada 1, see Lassen, *I. AA*, i. 105
11 793 n.

mentioned also in another Sūtra, the Nidana-Sūtra, the same is the case with Dhanurmyya. Besides these, however, Latyayana mentions a number of other teachers and schools, as, for example, his own *śhāryas*, with especial frequency, the Arsheyā-Kalpa two different Gautamas, one being distinguished by the surname Sthavira (a technical title, especially with the Buddhists), further Śauchī-rikshī (a teacher known to Panini), Kshairakalambhī, Kautsa, Varshaganya, Bhanditayana, Lamakayana, Ranayaniputray, &c., and in particular, the Śatyayanins, and their work, the Satyayanaka, together with the Śālaṅkayanins, the latter of whom are well known to belong to the western part of India. Such allusions occur in the Sūtra of Latyayana, as in the other Sūtras of the Samaveda, much more frequently than in the Sutras of the other Vedas, and are in my opinion evidence of their priority to the latter. At the time of the former there still existed manifold differences of opinion, while in that of the latter a greater unity and fixedness of exegesis, of dogma, and of worship had been attained. The remaining data appear also to point to such a priority, unless we have to explain them merely from the difference of locality. The condition of the Śudras as well as of the Nishadas &c., the Indian aborigines, does not here appear to be one of such oppression and wretchedness as it afterwards became. It was permitted to sojourn with them (Sandilya, it is true, restricts this permission to "in the neighbourhood of their *grāmas*"), and they themselves were allowed to attend in person at the ceremonies, although outside of the sacrificial ground. They are, moreover, now and then represented, though for the most part in a mean capacity as taking an actual part on such occasions, which is not to be thought of in later times. Toleration was still a matter of necessity, for, as we likewise see, the strict Brahmanical principle was not yet recognised even among the neighbouring Aryan tribes. These, equally with the Brahmanical Indians, held in high esteem the songs and customs of their ancestors, and devoted to them quite as much study as the Brahmanical Indians did, nay, the latter now and then directly resorted to the former, and borrowed distinct ceremonies from them. This is sufficiently clear from the particulars of one ceremony of the

kind, which is embodied, not indeed in the Pañchaviṅśa-Brahmana, but in the Shadvīṅśa-Brahmana, and which is described at full length by Lātyāyana. It is an imprecatory ceremony (called *śyena*, falcon), and this naturally suggests the idea that the ceremonial of the Atharvan, which is essentially based upon imprecations and magical expedients,—as well as the songs of the Atharvan itself,—may perhaps chiefly owe its cultivation to these western, non-Brahmanical, Aryan tribes. The general name given to these tribes by Lātyayana (and with this Pāṇini v 2 21 agrees) is Vratīnas, and he further draws a distinction between their *yādhas*, warriors, and their *arhants*, teachers. Their *anuchānas*, *i.e.*, those versed in Scripture, are to be chosen priests for the above-mentioned sacrifice Śundilya limits this to the *arhants* alone, which latter word—subsequently, as is well known, employed exclusively as a Buddhistic title—is also used in the Brahmana of the White Yajus, and in the Aranyaka of the Black Yajus, to express a teacher in general. The turban and garments of these priests should be red (*lohita*) according to Shadvīṅśa and Lātyayana, and we find the same colour assigned to the sacrificial robes of the priests of the Rākshasas in Laṅkā, in the Rāmāyana, vi. 19 110, 51 21, with which may be compared the light red, yellowish red (*kashāya*) garments of the Buddhists (see for instance Mrichhakat, pp 112, 114, ed Stenzler, M-Bhar, xii. 566, 11898, Yajnav, i 272), and the red (*raita*) dress of the Samkhyabhikshu * in the Laghujataka of Varaha Mihira. Now, that these western non-Brahmanical Vratīyas, Vratīnas, were put precisely upon a par with the eastern non-Brahmanical, *i.e.*, Buddhistic, teachers, appears from an addition which is given by Lātyayana to the description of the Vratīyastomas as found in the Pañchaviṅśa-Brahmana. We are there told that the converted Vratīyas, *i.e.*, those who have entered into the Brahman community, must, in order to cut off all connection with their past, hand over their wealth to those of their companions who still abide by the old mode of life—thereby transferring to these their own former impurity—or else, to a “Brahma-

* According to the commentary, or should this be *śākyabhikṣu*?
See I & II 287

bandhu Magadhadeśīya." This latter expression is only explicable if we assume that Buddhism, with its anti-Brahmanical tendencies was at the time flourishing in Magadha, and the absence of any such allusion in the Pañchavinsā-Brahmana is significant as to the time which elapsed between this work and the Sūtra of Latyayana.*

The first seven *prapātraśas* of the Latyayana-Sūtra comprise the rules common to all Soma sacrifices, the eighth and part of the ninth book treat, on the contrary, of the separate *śākhās*, the remainder of the ninth book, of the *ahīnas*, and the tenth, of the *sāttvas*. We have an excellent commentary on it by Agnisvamin,⁶ who belongs probably to the same period as the other commentators whose names terminate in *śrāmīn*, as Bhacrasvamin, Bharatasvamin, Dhūrtasvamin, Harisvamin, Khadirasvamin, Meghasvamin, Skandasvamin, Kśirasvamin, &c., their time, however, is as yet undetermined.⁷

The third Sama-Sutra, that of *Dīkṣādyaya*, differs but slightly from the Latyayana-Sutra. It belongs to the school of the Ranayaniyas. We meet with the name of these latter in the Ranayaniputra of Latyayana, his family is descended from Vrsāltha, for which reason this Sutra is also directly called *Vrsāltha-Sūtra*. For the name Drahayayana nothing analogous can be adduced.⁸ The difference between this Sutra and that of Latyayana

* In the Rik S. 10.1.1, where the Kikatas—the ancient name of the people of Magadha—and their king Pramagadha are mentioned as hostile, we have probably to think of the aborigines of the country, and not of hostile Aryas (?). It seems not impossible that the native inhabitants, being particularly vigorous, retained more influence in Magadha than elsewhere, even after the country had been brahmanised,—a process which perhaps was never completely effected—at any rate the community of the Brahmans as Latyayana as happened elsewhere also, and that this is how we have to account for the special sympathy and success which Bṛ. 1.1.1.1 met with in Magadha, these native inhabitants

being a regular means of recovering their old position though under new form.

⁶ We now possess in the *F. B. J. Ind. 2* (870-72) an edition of the Latyayana Sūtra with Agnisvamin's commentary by Anandachandana Vedantavigīṣa.

⁷ We find quite a cluster of Brahman names in names in an inscription dated Saka 627 in *Journ. Ind. 1* by Brachet *Ind. A. S.* in 208 (1851) 71 in an undated inscription in *Journal As. Or. Soc.* vi. 389.

⁸ It first occurs in the *Vand. Brahmana* who a first list of teachers probably refers to this very school see *I. St. iv.* 378 *drāśa* said to be a first list of teachers of words see Hem. p. 216 1. 87, 120.

is mainly confined to the different distribution of the matter, which is on the whole identical, and even expressed in the same words. I have not yet met with a complete codex of the whole work, but only with its beginning and its end, in two different commentaries, the date of which it is not yet possible to determine—the beginning, namely, in Maghasvāmin's commentary, remodelled by Rudrasāṇḍa, the end in the excellent commentary of Dhanvān.

The only knowledge I have of a Śrauta-Sūtra by Gobhila is derived from a notice of Roth's (*op. c.* pp 55, 56), according to which Kṛtyachintāmaṇi is said to have composed a commentary upon it⁷⁹

In a far more important degree than he differs from Drahyaṇa does Latyāṇa differ, on the one hand, from Kātyāṇa, who in his Śrauta-Sūtra, belonging to the White Yajus, treats in books 22–24 of the *ekāhas*, *ahīnas*, and *sattras*, and on the other, from the Rik-Sūtras of Āśvalayana and Śaṅkhāyana, which likewise deal with these subjects in their proper place. In these there is no longer any question of differences of opinion, the stricter view represented by Śāṇḍilya in the Latyāṇa-Sūtra has everywhere triumphed. The ceremonies on the Sarasvatī and the Vratyastomas have also become, in a local sense too, further removed from actual life, as appears both from the slight consideration with which they are treated, and from modifications of names, &c., which show a forgetting of the original form. Many of the ceremonies discussed in the Sama-Sūtras are, moreover, entirely wanting in the Sūtras of the other Vedas, and those which are found in the latter are enumerated in tabular fashion rather than fully discussed—a difference which naturally originated in the diversity of purpose, the subject of the Sūtra of the Yajus being the duties of the Adhvaryu, and that of the Sūtras of the Rik the duties of the Hotar.

A fourth Sama-Sūtra is the *Anupada-Sūtra*, in ten *prapāthakas*, the work of an unknown author. It explains

⁷⁹ The name Kṛtyachintāmaṇi probably belongs to the work itself, compare / *St.* i. 60, ii. 396, *Aufrechti, Catalogus*, p. 365^a, but on a Śrauta Sūtra of Gobhila remains doubtful in the meantime, since such a work is not mentioned elsewhere.

the obscure passages of the Pañchaviṃśa-Brahmana, and, it would appear, of the Shadvīṃśa-Brahmana also, accompanying the text step by step. It has not as yet been closely examined, but it promises to prove a rich mine of material for the history of Brahmanical theology, as it makes mention of, and appeals to, an extremely large number of different works. For example, of schools of the Rik, it cites the Antareyins, the Patūgins, the Kaushītaka, of schools of the Yajus, the Adhvaryus in general, further, the Śatyayanins, Khādayanins, the Taittirīyas, the Kathaka, the Kalabavins, Bhallavins, Śambuvins, Vajasaneyins, and frequently also *śruti*, *smṛiti*, *āchāryas*, &c. It is a work which deserves to be very thoroughly studied.⁸⁰

While the above-named four Sūtras of the Samaveda specially attach themselves to the Pañchaviṃśa-Brahmana, the Sūtras now to be mentioned stand out more independently beside the latter, although of course, in part at least, often referring to it. In the first place, we have to mention the *Nidāna-Sūtra*, which contains in ten *prapāthakas* metrical and other similar investigations on the different *ukthas*, *stomas*, and *gānas*. The name of the author is not given. The word *nidāna*, 'root,' is used with reference to metre in the Brahmana of the White Yajus,⁸¹ and though in the two instances where the *Nidānas* are mentioned by Yaska, their activity appears to have been directed less to the study of metre than to that of roots, etymology, still the *Nidānasamjñaka Grantha* is found cited in the *Bṛihaddevata*, 5 5, either directly as the *Śruti* of the *Chhandogas*, or at least as containing their *Śruti*.^{*} This Sūtra is especially remarkable for the great number of Vedic schools and teachers whose various opinions it adduces, and in this respect it stands on pretty much the same level as the *Anupada-Sūtra*. It differs from it, however, by its particularly frequent quotation

⁸⁰ Unfortunately we do not even now know of more than one MS, see *I St*, I 43.

⁸¹ This is wrong, on the contrary, the word has quite a general meaning in the passages in question (e.g., in *gāyatri id eka nidāna*,

or *yo vā aīd 'gnir gāyatri sa nidāna*).

^{*} *Nidāna*, in the sense of 'cause, foundation' is a favourite word in the Buddhist Sūtras, see Burnouf *Introd. à l'Histoire du Bouddhisme* Indien, pp 59, ff, 484, ff.

also of the views of the Sáman theologians named by Latyáyana and Dráhyáyana, viz, Dhanamjayya, Sandilya, Śaichivrikshi, &c—a thing which seldom or never occurs in the former. The animosity to the Kaushítakis, with which we have already become acquainted in the Pañchaviṅśa-Brahmana, is here again exhibited most vividly in some words attributed to Dhanamjayya. With regard to the Rígvēda, the *daśatayí* division into ten *mandalas* is mentioned, as in Yaska. The allusion to the Átharvānikas, as well as to the Anubrāhmanins, is particularly to be remarked, the latter peculiar name is not met with elsewhere, except in Panini. A special study of this Sūtra is also much to be desired, as it likewise promises to open up a wealth of information regarding the condition of literature at that period.⁸²

Not much information of this sort is to be expected from the *Pushpa-Sūtra* of Gobhila* which has to be named along with the Nidána Sūtra. The understanding of this Sūtra is, moreover, obstructed by many difficulties. For not only does it cite the technical names of the *sámans*, as well as other words, in a very curtailed form, it also makes use of a number of grammatical and other technical terms, which, although often agreeing with the corresponding ones in the Pratiśakhya-Sūtras, are yet also often formed in quite a peculiar fashion, here and there, indeed, quite after the algebraic type so favoured by Panini. This is particularly the case in the first four *prapáthakas*, and it is precisely for these that, up to the present time at least, no commentary has been found, whereas for the remaining six we possess a very good commentary by Upadhyaya Ajataśatru†. The work treats of the modes in which the separate *richas*, by various insertions, &c, are transformed into *sámans*, or “made to blossom,” as it were, which is evidently the origin of the name *Pushpa-Sūtra*, or ‘Flower Sutra.’ In addition to

⁸² See *I St.*, i 44, ff. the first two *paśalas*, which have special reference to metre, have been edited and translated by me in *I St.*, viii 85-124. For Anubrāhmanins, *93, see also *Áśv Sr.*, ii 8 11, and Schol on *T S.*, i 8 1 1.

* So, at least, the author is called in the colophons of two chapters in MS. Chambers 220 [Catalogue of the Berlin MSS., p 76].

† Composed for his pupil Viśvavyāsa.

the Pravachana, &c (according to the commentary), Brahmana, of the Kálavavins and that of the Śatyayanins, I found, on a cursory inspection, mention also of the Kautumas. This is the first time that their name appears in a work connected with Vedic literature. Some portions of the work, particularly in the last books, are composed in *ślokas*, and we have, doubtless, to regard it as a compilation of pieces belonging to different periods.⁸² In close connection with it stands the *Sāma-Tantra*, composed in the same manner, and equally unintelligible without a commentary. It treats, in thirteen *prapāṭhakas*, of accent and the accentuation of the separate verses. A commentary on it is indeed extant, but at present only in a fragmentary form. At its close the work is denoted as the *vṛāharāṇa*, grammar, of the Sāman theologians.⁸³

Several other Sūtras also treat of the conversion of *ruchas* into *sāmans*, &c. One of these, the *Pañcharidhi-Sūtra* (*Pāñcharidhya*, *Pañcharidheya*), is only known to me from quotations, according to which, as well as from its name, it treats of the five different *vidhis* (modes) by which this process is effected. Upon a second, the *Pratishāra-Sūtra*, which is ascribed to Kātyāyana, a commentary called *Daśatayī* was composed by Varadaraja, the above-mentioned commentator of Maṣaka. It treats of the aforesaid five *vidhis*, with particular regard to the one called *pratishāra*. The *Tandālakshana-Sūtra* is only known to me by name, as also the *Upagrantha-Sūtra*,* both of which, with the two other works just named, are, according to the catalogue, found in the Fort-William

⁸² In Dekhan MSS the work is called *Phulla-Sūtra*, and is ascribed to Vararuchi, not to Gobhila. see Burnell, *Catalogue*, pp. 45, 46. On this and other points of difference, see my paper *Ueber das Sapatala-kam des Hāla* (1870) pp. 258, 259. I now possess a copy of the text and commentary, but have nothing of consequence to add to the above remarks.

⁸³ See also Burnell *Catalogue* pp. 40, 41.—*Ibid.* p. 41 we find a *Svaraparibhāṣā*, or *Sāmālakṣhaṇa*, specified. Kātyāyana also mentions a *śāmalakṣhaṇam* *prāśasthyaṃ* &c.

fram by which he explains the word *ulthārtha* which, according to the *Mahābhāṣya*, is at the foundation of *anukṛti*, whose formation is taught by Panini himself (iv 2 60), see *I Śā.* xiii. 447. According to this it certainly seems very doubtful whether the *Sāmālakṣhaṇa* mentioned by Kātyāyana is to be identified with the extant work bearing the same name.

* *Shadguruśābha*, in the introduction to his commentary on the *Anukramanī* of the *Rik*, describes Kātyāyana as '*upagranthakāya kāraka*,

collection of MSS. By the anonymous transcriber of the Berlin MS of the *Maṣaka-Sūtra*, who is of course a very weak authority, ten Śrauta-Sūtras for the Samaveda are enumerated at the close of the MS, viz., besides *Latyayana*, *Anupada*, *Nidāna*, *Kalpa*, *Tandalakshana*, *Pañchavidheya*, and the *Upagranthas*, also the *Kalpānupada*, *Anustotra*, and the *Kṣaudras*. What is to be understood by the three last names must for the present remain undecided.⁸⁵

The *Grihya-Sūtra* of the Samaveda belongs to *Gobhila*, the same to whom we also found a Śrauta-Sūtra and the *Pushpa-Sūtra* ascribed.⁸⁶ His name has a very unvedic ring, and nothing in any way corresponding to it appears in the rest of Vedic literature.⁸⁷ In what relation this work, drawn up in four *prapāthakas*, stands to the *Grihya-Sūtras* of the remaining Vedas has not yet been investigated.⁸⁸ A supplement (*pariśiṣṭa*) to it is the *Karma-pradīpa* of *Kātyāyana*. In its introductory words it expressly acknowledges itself to be such a supplement to *Gobhila*, but it has also been regarded both as a second *Grihya-Sūtra* and as a *Smṛiti-Śāstra*. According to the statement of *Āśarka*, the commentator of this *Karma-pradīpa*, the *Grihya-Sūtra* of *Gobhila* is authoritative for both the schools of the Samaveda, the *Kaushthas* as well as the *Rānayanīyas* *—Is the *Khādīra Grihya*, which is now and then mentioned, also to be classed with the Samaveda?⁸⁹

⁸⁵ On the *Pañchavidhi Sūtra* and the *Kalpānupada*, each in two *prapāthakas*, and the *Kṣaudra*, in three *prapāthakas*, see Müller, *A. S. L.*, p. 210, Aufrecht, *Catalogue*, p. 377. The *Upagrantha-Sūtra* treats of expiations, *pratyakṣitas*, see Rājendra L. M., *Notes of Sanskrit MSS.*, II. 182.

⁸⁶ To him is also ascribed a *Naiṣeya-Sūtra*, "a description of the metres of the Samaveda," see Colin Browning *Catalogue of Sanskrit MSS. existing in Oude* (1873), p. 4.

⁸⁷ A list of teachers belonging to the *Gobhila* school is contained in the *Viśva-Brahmaṇa*.

⁸⁸ An edition of the *Gobhila Grihya-Sūtra*, with a very diffuse commentary by the editor, Chan-

drakānta Tarkālakṣaṇa, has been commenced in the *Bibl. Indica* (1871), the fourth fasciculus (1873) reaches to li. 8. 12. See the sections relating to nuptial ceremonies in Haas's paper, *J. St.*, v. 283, ff.

* Among the authors of the *Smṛiti-Śāstras* a *Kuṭhumi* is also mentioned.

⁸⁹ Certainly. In Burnell's *Catalogue*, p. 56 the *Dṛiḥyāyana-Grihya Sūtra* (in four *paṭalas*) is attributed to *Khādīra*. *Rudraskandasvāmīn* composed a *vyākhyāna* on this work also (see p. 80), and *Vāmana* is named as the author of '*Īrtiśāstra* to the *Grihya Sūtras* of *Khādīra*,' Burnell, p. 57. To the *Grihya-Sūtras* of the Samaveda probably belong also *Gautama's Pūṣpamedha-Sūtra*

As representative of the last stage of the literature of the Samaveda, we may specify, on the one hand, the various *Paddhatis* (outlines) and commentaries, &c, which connect themselves with the Sūtras, and serve as an explanation and further development of them, and, on the other, that peculiar class of short treatises bearing the name of *Parīśiṣṭas*, which are of a somewhat more independent character than the former, and are to be looked upon more as supplements to the Sūtras*. Among these, the already mentioned *Arsha* and *Danata*—enumerations of the Rishis and deities—of the Samhita in the Naigeya-Śakha deserve prominent notice. Both of these treatises refer throughout to a comparatively ancient tradition, for example, to the Nairuktas, headed by Yaska and Śakapūni, to the Naighantukas, to Śaunaka (i.e., probably to his Anukramanī of the Rik), to their own Brahmana, to Aitareya and the Aitareyins, to the Satapathukas, to the Pravachana Kathaka, and to Āśvalayana. The *Dālhbhya-Parīśiṣṭa* ought probably also to be mentioned here, it bears the name of an individual who appears several times in the Chhândoggyopanishad, but particularly often in the Puranas as one of the sages who conduct the dialogue

The *Yayurveda*, to which we now turn, is distinguished above the other Vedas by the great number of different schools which belong to it. This is at once a consequence and a proof of the fact that it became pre-eminently the subject of study, inasmuch as it contains the formulas for the entire sacrificial ceremonial, and indeed forms its

(cf. Burnell, p. 57 the commentator Anantayajvan identifies the author with Akahapāda, the author of the Nyāya Sutra) and the *Gautama-Dharma Sutra*, see the section treating of the legal literature.

* Kāṇḍīyīnīya in his commen-

tary on the Grihya-Sutra of the White Yajus several times ascribes their authorship to a Kātyāyana (India Office Library, No. 440, fol. 52*, 56, 58*, &c.), or do the quotations only refer to the above-named Kāṇḍīyīnīya.

proper foundation, whilst the Rigveda prominently, and the Sāmaveda exclusively, devote themselves to a part of it only, viz, to the Soma sacrifice. The Yajurveda divides itself, in the first place, into two parts, the *Black* and the *White Yajus*. These, upon the whole, indeed, have their matter in common, but they differ fundamentally from each other as regards its arrangement. In the Samhitā of the Black Yajus the sacrificial formulas are for the most part immediately followed by their dogmatic explanation, &c, and by an account of the ceremonial belonging to them, the portion bearing the name of Brahmana differing only in point of time from this Samhitā, to which it must be viewed as a supplement. In the White Yajus, on the contrary, the sacrificial formulas, and their explanation and ritual, are entirely separated from one another, the first being assigned to the Samhitā, and their explanation and ritual to the Brahmana, as is also the case in the Rigveda and the Sāmaveda. A further difference apparently consists in the fact that in the Black Yajus very great attention is paid to the Hotar and his duties, which in the White Yajus is of rare occurrence. By the nature of the case in such matters what is undigested is to be regarded as the commencement, as the earlier stage, and what exhibits method as the later stage, and this view will be found to be correct in the present instance. As each Yajus possesses an entirely independent literature, we must deal with each separately.

First, of the *Black Yajus*. The data thus far known to us concerning it open up such extensive literary perspectives, but withal in such a meagre way, that investigation has, up to the present time, been less able to attain to approximately satisfactory results* than in any other field. In the first place, the name "Black Yajus" belongs only to a later period, and probably arose in contradistinction to that of the White Yajus. While the theologians of the Rik are called Babrīchas, and those of the Saman Chhāndogas, the old name for the theologians of the Yajus is Adhvaryus, and, indeed, these three names are already so

* See *I St.*, i. 63 ff. [All the been published, see the ensuing text, with the exception of the notes.]
Sutras relating to ritual, have now

employed in the Samhitá of the Black Yajus and the Brahmana of the White Yajus. In the latter work the designation Adhvaryus is applied to its own adherents, and the Charakadhvaryus are denoted and censured as their adversaries—an enmity which is also apparent in a passage of the Samhitá of the White Yajus, where the Charakacharya, as one of the persons to be dedicated at the Purushamedha, is devoted to Dushkrita, or "Ill deed." This is all the more strange, as the term *charaka* is otherwise always used in a good sense, for "travelling scholar;" as is also the root *char*, "to wander about for instruction." The explanation probably consists simply in the fact that the name Charakas is also, on the other hand, applied to one of the principal schools of the Black Yajus, whence we have to assume that there was a direct enmity between these and the adherents of the White Yajus who arose in opposition to them—a hostility similarly manifested in other cases of the kind. A second name for the Black Yajus is "Taittiríya," of which no earlier appearance can be traced than that in its own Prátisákhyas-Sútra, and in the Sâma-Sutras. Panini* connects this name with a Rishi called Tittiri, and so does the Anukramani to the Átreya school, which we shall have frequent occasion to mention in the sequel. Later legends, on the contrary, refer it to the transformation of the pupils of Vaisampayana into partridges (*tittiri*), in order to pick up the *yajus*-verses disgorged by one of their companions who was wroth with his teacher. However absurd this legend may be, a certain amount of sense yet lurks beneath its surface. The Black Yajus is, in fact, a motley, undigested jumble of different pieces, and I am myself more inclined to derive the name Taittiríya from the variegated partridge (*tittiri*) than from the Rishi Tittiri, just as another name of one of the principal schools of the Black Yajus, that of the Khândikíyas, probably owes its formation to

* The rule referred to (iv 3 102) is, according to the statement of the Calcutta scholar not explained in Patanjali's Bháshya, possibly therefore it may not be Pânini's at all but may be later than Patanjali. [The name Taittiríya itself,

however is several times mentioned in the Bháshya, see I & xii. 442, which is also acquainted with 'Tittirind prokṛtā śloka', not belonging to the Chhandas, see I & v 41, Goldtucker's *Pāṇini*, p 243.]

this very fact of the Black Yajus being made up of *khandas*, fragments, although Pāṇini,* as in the case of Taittirīya, traces it to a Rishi of the name of Khāṇḍika, and although we do really meet with a Khāṇḍika (Audbhān) in the Brāhmana of the White Yajus (xi 8 4 1)

Of the many schools which are allotted to the Black Yajus, all probably did not extend to Samhitā and Brahmana, some probably embraced the Sūtras only † Thus far, at least, only three different recensions of the Samhitā are directly known to us, two of them in the text itself, the third merely from an Anukramanī of the text. The two first are the *Taittirīya-Samhitā*, κατ' ἐξοχήν so called which is ascribed to the school of Āpastamba, a subdivision of the Khāṇḍikīyas, and the *Kāthaka*, which belongs to the school of the Charikas, and that particular subdivision of it which bears the name of Chaitanyīyas ‡ The Samhitā, &c, of the Ātreya school, a subdivision of the Aukhīyas, is only known to us by its Anukramanī, it agrees in essentials with that of Āpastamba. This is not the case with the Kathaka, which stands on a more independent footing, and occupies a kind of intermediate position between the Black and the White Yajus, agreeing frequently with the latter as to the readings, and with the former in the arrangement of the matter. The Kathaka, together with the *Hārīdravika*—a lost work, which, however, likewise certainly belonged to the Black Yajus, viz, to the school of the Hārīdravīyas, a subdivision of the Maitrāyanīyas—is the only work of the Brāhmana order mentioned by name in Yaska's Nirukta. Pāṇini, too, makes direct reference to it in a rule, and it is further alluded to in the Anupada-Sūtra and Bṛihaddevatā. The name of the Kathas does not appear in other Vedic writings, nor does that of Āpastamba §

* The rule is the same as that for Taittirī. The remark in the previous note, therefore, applies here also.

† As is likewise the case with the other Vedas.

‡ Besides the text, we have also a Rukhyanukramanī for it.

§ In later writings several Kathas are distinguished, the Kathas, the Prāchya Kathas and the Kapiśa

thaka Kathas. The epithet of these last is found in Pāṇini (viii 3 91) and Megasthenes mentions the Καπισηδοί as a people in the Iauyā—In the Fort William Catalogue a Kapishkala Samhitā is mentioned [see I St., xii 375, 439]—At the time of the Mahābhārata the position of the Kathas must have been one of great consideration, since

The Samhita of the Āpastamba school consists of seven books (called *ashṭakās* १), these again are divided into 44 *prāśnas*, 651 *anurāhas*, and 2198 *landikās*, the latter being separated from one another on the principle of an equal number of syllables to each.⁶⁰ Nothing definite can be ascertained as to the extent of the Ātreya recension, it is likewise divided into *landās*, *prāśnas*, and *anurāhas*, the first words of which coincide mostly with those of the corresponding sections of the Āpastamba school. The Kathaka is quite differently divided, and consists of five parts, of which the three first are in their turn divided into forty *sthāṇakās*, and a multitude of small sections (also probably separated according to the number of words), while the fourth merely specifies the *richas* to be sung by the Hotar, and the fifth contains the formulas belonging to the horse sacrifice. In the colophons to the three first parts, the Charaka-Śakha is called *Iṣṭimikā*, *Madhyamikā*, and *Orimikā*, respectively the first and last of these three appellations are still unexplained.⁶¹ The Brahmana portion in these works is extremely meagre as regards the ritual, and gives but an imperfect picture of it, it is, however, peculiarly rich in legends of a mythological character. The sacrificial formulas themselves are on the whole the same as those contained in the Samhita of the White Yajus, but the order is different, although the

they—and their text, the Kāthaka—are repeatedly mentioned, see *I St.*, xii. 437. 8. The founder of their school, Kāṭha, appears in the Mahābhārata as Vaiśampāyana's pupil, and the Kāṭhas themselves appear in close connection with the Kālāpas and Kāṭhumbas, both schools of the Sāman. In the Rāmāyana, too, the Kāṭha Kālāpas are mentioned as being much esteemed in Ayodhya (ii. 32. 18, Schlegel). Haradatta's statement, "*Bakṛicchā namāpyasī Kāṭhakāṭhā*" (Bhaṭṭojī's *Siddh Kaum* ed. Tārānātha (1865), vol. ii p. 524, on Pān., vii. 4. 38), probably rests upon some misunderstanding, see *I St.*, xii. 438.]

constitutes the norm, fifty words, as a rule, form a *landikā*, see *I St.*, xi. 13, xii. 90, xii. 97-99. Instead of *ashṭakā*, we find also the more correct name *landā*, and instead of *prāśna*, which is peculiar to the Taittiriya texts, the generally employed term, *prapāṭhā*, see *I St.*, xi. 13, 124.—The last Brāhmin and the Taitt. Ār., are also subdivided into *landikās*, and these again into very small sections, but the principle of these divisions has not yet been clearly ascertained.

⁶¹ *Iṣṭimikā* is to be derived from *keṣṭhima* (from *keṣṭhā*, i. e., *edha* 'di) and *Orimikā* from *ururima* (from *urari*), see my paper, *Ueber die Bhaṭṭas der Jaina*, i. 424, n.

⁶⁰ It is not the number of syllables, but the number of words that

order of the ceremonial to which they belong is pretty much the same. There are also many discrepancies with regard to the words, we may instance, in particular, the expansion of the semi-vowels *v* and *y* after a consonant into *uv* and *iy*, which is peculiar to the Āpastamba school.²² As to data, geographical or historical, &c. (here, of course, I can only speak of the Āpastamba school and the Kathaka) in consequence of the identity of matter these are essentially the same as those which meet us in the Samhita of the White Yajus (In the latter, however, they are more numerous, formulas being also found here for ceremonies which are not known in the former—the *purushamedha*, for instance) Now these data—to which we must add some other scattered allusions* in the portions bearing the character of a Brahmana—carry us back, as we shall see, to the flourishing epoch of the kingdom of the Kuru-Pañchala,²³ in which district we must therefore recognise the place of origin of both works. Whether this also holds good of their final redaction is another question, the answer to which, as far as the Āpastamba-Samhita is concerned, naturally depends upon the amount of influence in its arrangement to be ascribed to Āpastamba, whose name it bears. The Kathaka, according to what has been stated above, appears to have existed as an entirely finished work even in Yāska's time, since he quotes it, the Anukramanī of the Ātreya school, on the contrary, makes Yāska Paṇḍit²⁴ (as the pupil of Vātsam-pāyana) the teacher of Tittiri, the latter again the in-

²² For further particulars, see *I St.*, pp. 104–106.

* Amongst them, for example, the enumeration of the whole of the inner asterism is the Āpastamba Samhita, where they appear in an order departing from that of the later series, which, as I have pointed out above (p. 30) must necessarily have been fixed between 1472 and 536 B.C. But all that follows from this, in regard to the passage in question, is that it is not earlier than 1472 B.C., which is a matter of course it now follows that it may not be later than 536 B.C. So we obtain nothing definite here

[This remains correct, though the position of the case itself is somewhat different see the notes above, p. 2 and p. 30. In connection with the enumeration of the Nakshatras, compare especially my essay, *Die vedischen Nachrichten von den Nakshatras*, II. 279 ff.]

²³ Of peculiar interest is the mention of Dhritarāshtra Vaischitravirya, as also of the contests between the Pañchālas and the Kurus in the Kathaka, see *I St.*, pp. 469–472.

²⁴ , *śiṣya* Dhīlara Mura, on the contrary gives Yājñavalkya instead of Paṇḍit, see Barnell's *Catalogue*, p. 14.

structor of Ukha, and Ukha the preceptor of Ātreya.* This at least clearly exhibits its author's view of the priority of Yaska to the schools and redactions of the Black Yajus bearing the names of Tittiri and Ātreya, although the data necessary to prove the correctness of this view are wanting. That, however, some sort of influence in the arrangement of the Samhita of the Black Yajus is certainly to be attributed to Yaska, is evident further from the fact that Bhatta Bhaskara Miśra, in an extant fragment of his commentary on the Āpastamba-Samhita,† quotes, side by side with the views of Kaśakṛtsna and Ekachūrṇi regarding a division of the text, the opinion of Yaska also.

Along with the Kathaka, the *Mūnata* and the *Mantra* are very frequently quoted in the commentaries on the Kāṭiya-Sūtra of the White Yajus. We do not, it is true, find these names in the Sūtras or similar works, but at all events they are meant for works resembling the Kathaka, as is shown by the quotations themselves, which are often of considerable length. Indeed, we also find, although only in later writings, the *Matrāyanīyas*, and, as a subdivision of these, the *Manavas*, mentioned as schools of the Black Yajus. Possibly these works may still be in existence in India.‡

* Ātreya was the *padakṛdā* of his school, Kūṇḍina, on the contrary, the *vr̥ttikṛdā*. The meaning of *vr̥ttikṛdā* is here obscure, as it is also in Schol. to Pāp., iv 3 108 (*maddhūṣi vr̥ttikṛdā*) [see *I St.*, xiii, 381].

† We have, besides, a commentary by Śāyana, though it is only fragmentary; another is ascribed to a Lāṭkapaṇḍita. (In Burnell's Collection of MSS, see his *Catalogue*, pp. 12-14, is found the greater portion of Bhatta Kauśika Bhāskara Miśra's commentary, under the name *Jñānāyana*, the author is said to have lived 400 years before Śāyana, he quotes amongst others Bhāṣṣvamin, and seems to stand in special connection with the Ātreya school. A *Pañcīkabhāṣya* on the Black Yajus is also mentioned, see *I St.*, ix 176.—An edition of the *Taittirīya Saṃhita* in the *Bibl. Indica*,

with Śāyana's complete commentary, was commenced by Pörr (1854) continued by Cowell and E. A. Nārāyaṇa, and is now in the hands of Mahēśachandra Nyāyaratna (the last part, No. 28, 1874, reaches to iv 3 11), the complete text in Roman transcript, has been published by myself in *I St.*, xi, xii (1871-72). On the Kathaka, see *I St.*, iii 451-479.)

‡ According to the Fort William Catalogue, the 'Matrāyanī Śākhā' is in existence there. [O her MSS have since been found, see Haug in *I St.*, ix 175, and his essay *Brāhmaṇa und die Brahmanen*, pp. 31-34 (1871) and Buhler's detailed survey of the works composing this 'Śākhā' in *I St.* xiii 107 117-128. According to this, the *Matrā Samhita* consists at present of five *kāṇḍas*, two of which, however, are but in *śrāddha*

Besides the Samhitā so called, there is a Brahmana recognised by the school of Āpastamba, and also by that of Ātreya,* which, however, as I have already remarked, differs from the Samhitā, not as to the nature of its contents, but only in point of time, it is, in fact, to be regarded merely as a supplement to it. It either reproduces the formulas contained in the Samhitā and connects them with their proper ritual, or it develops further the liturgical rules already given there, or again, it adds to these entirely new rules, as, for instance, those concerning the *purushamedha*, which is altogether wanting in the Samhitā, and those referring to the sacrifices to the lunar asterisms. Only the third and last book, in twelve *prapāṭhakas*, together with Sayana's commentary, is at present known.⁹⁵ The three last *prapāṭhakas*, which contain four different sections, relating to the manner of preparing certain peculiarly sacred sacrificial fires, are ascribed in the Anukramanī of the Ātreya school (and this is also confirmed by Sayana in another place) to the sage Katha. Two other sections also belong to it, which, it seems, are only found in the Ātreya school, and not in that of Āpastamba, and also, lastly, the two first books of the Taittirīya-Āranyaka, to be mentioned presently. Together these eight sections evidently form a supplement to the Kathaka above discussed, they do not, however, appear to exist as an independent work, but only in connection with the Brahmana and Āranyaka of the Āpastamba- (and Ātreya-) schools, from which, for the rest they can be externally distinguished easily enough by the absence of the expansion of *v* and *y* into *uv* and *iy*. The legend quoted towards the end of the second of these sections (*prap* xi. 8), as to the visit of Nachiketas, to the lower

ditions, viz., the Upanishad (see below) which passes as *kāṇḍa* II, and the last *Lāṇḍa*, called *Khila*.]

* At least as regards the fact, for the designation Samhitā or Brāhmaṇa does not occur in its Anukramanī. On the contrary, it passes without any break from the portions which belong in the Āpastamba school to the Samhitā, to those there belonging to the Brāhmaṇa.

⁹⁵ All three books have been

edited, with Śiṣya's commentary, in the *Bibl. Ind.* (1855-70) by Rājendra Lal Mitra. The *Hiranyakeśikā* Brāhmaṇa quoted by Bühler, *Catalogue of Sanskrit MSS. from Gajard.* I. 38, is not likely to depart much from the ordinary Āpastamba text: the respective Śrauta Sūtras at least agree almost literally with each other, see Bühler, *Āpastambīya dharmasūtra*, Preface, p. 6 (1868).

world, gave rise to an Upanishad of the Atharva in which bears the name of Kathakopaniṣad. Now, between this supplement to the Kāthaka and the Kathaka itself a considerable space of time must have elapsed, as follows from the allusions made in the last sections to Mahā-Meru, Krauñcha, Mamaga, to Vaiśampāyana, Vyasa Paraśarya, &c., as well as from the literature therein presupposed as existing, the 'Atharvaṅgrasas,' Brāhmanas, Itihāsas, Puranas, Kalpas, Gathās, and Naraśaṁsis being enumerated as subjects of study (*śiḍhyā*). Further, the last but one of these sections is ascribed to another author, viz., to the Aruna, or to Āruna, whom the scholast on Pāṇini⁶⁶ speaks of as a pupil of Vaiśampāyana, a statement with which its mention of the latter as an authority tallies excellently, this section is perhaps therefore only erroneously assigned to the school of the Kathas.—The *Taittirīya-Āranyaka*, at the head of which that section stands (as already remarked), and which belongs both to the Āpastamba and Ātreya schools, must at all events be regarded as only a later supplement to their Brahmana, and belongs, like most of the Āranyakas, to the extreme end of the Vedic period. It consists of ten books, the first six of which are of a liturgical character the first and third books relate to the manner of preparing certain sacred sacrificial fires, the second to preparatives to the study of Scripture, and the fourth, fifth, and sixth to purificatory sacrifices and those to the Manes, corresponding to the last books of the *Samhita* of the White Yajus. The last four books of the *Āranyaka*, on the contrary, contain two Upanishads, viz., the seventh, eighth, and ninth books the *Taittirīyopaniṣad*, κατ' ἐξοχὴν so called, and the tenth, the *Yājñiki- or Nārāyaṇīyā Upanishad*. The former, or *Taittirīyopaniṣad*, is in three parts. The first is the *Samhitopaniṣad*, or *Śikṣāvallī*,* which begins with a short grammatical disquisition,⁶⁷ and then turns to

⁶⁶ Kanyāsa on Pāṇi, iv 2 104 (Mahābhāṣya, fol 73^b, ed Benares), he calls him, however, Aruna instead of Aruna, and derives from him the school of the Ārunins (not d in the Bhāṣya, *ibid*) the Arunins are cited in the Kāthaka itself, see *I St*, iii, 475

* *Vallī* means 'a creeper,' it is perhaps meant to describe these Upanishads as 'creepers,' which have attached themselves to the Veda-*Samhitā*.

⁶⁷ See above, p 61 Müller, *A S L*, p 113, ff Haug, *Ueber das Wesen des vedis hen Accents*, p 54.

the question of the unity of the world-spirit. The second and third are the *Anandarallī* and *Bhṛiguvallī* which together also go by the name of *Vārunī-Upanishad* and treat of the bliss of entire absorption in meditation upon the Supreme Spirit, and its identity with the individual soul*. If in these we have already a thoroughly systematised form of speculation, we are carried even further in one portion of the *Yajñikī-Upanishad*, where we have to do with a kind of sectarian worship of *Nārāyaṇa* the remaining part contains ritual supplements. Now, interesting as this whole *Āraṇyaka* is from its motley contents and evident piecing together of collected fragments of all sorts, it is from another point of view also of special importance for us, from the fact that its tenth book is actually extant in a double recension, viz, in a text which, according to Sayana's statements, belongs to the *Dravidas*, and in another, bearing the name of the *Andhras*, both names of peoples in the south-west of India. Besides these two texts, *Sāyana* also mentions a recension belonging to the *Karṇāṭakas*, and another whose name he does not give. Lastly, this tenth book† exists also as an *Atharvopaniṣad*, and here again with many variations, so that there is here opened up to criticism an ample field for researches and conjectures. Such, certainly, have not been wanting in Indian literary history, it is seldom, however, that the facts lie so ready to hand as we have them in this case, and thus we owe to *Sāyana's* commentary, which is here really excellent.

When we look about us for the other *Brāhmanas* of the *Black Yajus*, we find, in the first place, among the schools

* See a translation &c. of the *Taitt. Upaniṣad* in *I St.*, ii. 207-235. It has been edited, with *Samparka's* commentary, by Roer in *Bibl. Indica* vol. vii. [the text alone, as a portion of the *Taitt. Ar.*, by *Rājendra Lalā Mitra* also, see next note. Roer's translation appeared in vol. xv of the *Bibliotheca Indica*].

† See a partial translation of it in *I St.*, ii. 75-100. [It is published in the complete edition of the *Taitt. Āraṇyaka*, with *Sāyana's* commentary thereon (excepting books

vii.-ix., see the previous note), in *Bibl. Ind.* (1864-72), by *Rājendra Lalā Mitra*, the text is the *Dravida* text commented upon by *Sāyana*, in sixty-four *anuvākas*, the various readings of the *Andhra* text (in eighty *anuvākas*) being also added. In *Burnell's* collection there is also a commentary on the *Taitt. Ar.* by *Bhāṭṭa Bhāskara Māra*, which, like that on the *Saṃhitā*, is entitled *Judhayaṇas*; see *Burnell's Catalogue*, pp. 16, 17].

ited in the Sama-Sūtras two which must probably be considered as belonging to the Black Yajus viz, the *Bhāṭlavins* and the *Śatyāyanins*. The Brahmana of the *Bhāṭlavins* is quoted by the scholiast on Pāṇini probably following the Mahabhashya,⁹³ as one of the 'old' Brahmanas we find it mentioned in the Brihaddevata. Sureśvaracharya also, and even Sayana himself, quote passages from the Bhallaviśrutī. A passage supposed to be borrowed from the Bhallavi-Upanishad is adduced by the sect of the Madhavas in support of the correctness of their (Dvaita) belief (*As Res*, xvi 104). That the Bhallavins belong to the Black Yajus is, however, still uncertain, I only conclude so at present from the fact that Bhallaveya is the name of a teacher specially attacked and censured in the Brāhmana of the White Yajus. As to the *Śatyāyanins*, whose Brahmana is also reckoned among the 'old' ones by the scholiast on Pāṇini,⁹⁴ and is frequently quoted, especially by Sayana, it is pretty certain that they belong to the Black Yajus, as it is so stated in the Charanavyūha, a modern index of the different schools of the Vedas, and, moreover, a teacher named Satyajani is twice mentioned in the Brahmana of the White Yajus. The special regard paid to them in the Sama-Sūtras, and which, to judge from the quotations, they themselves paid to the Saman, is probably to be explained by the peculiar connection (itself still obscure) which we find elsewhere also between the schools of the Black Yajus and those of the Saman.¹⁰⁰ Thus, the Kātās are mentioned along with the Saman schools

⁹³ This is not so, for in the Bhāṭlavins to the particular sūtra of Pāṇ. (iv 3 105), the Bhāṭlavins are not mentioned. They are, however, mentioned elsewhere in the work, at iv 2 104 (here Kāyāta derives them from a teacher Bhalla Bhallavāda prokta adhvān) as a Bhāṭlavins. Matsya rajaputrah is cited in the Anupada vi 5, their home may have been in the country of the Matsyas, see *I St*, xii 441, 442. At the time of the Bhāṭlavika-Sūtra their Brāhmana text was still accentuated, in the same way as the Śatapatha see Kielhorn, *I St*, x, 421.

⁹⁴ The Mahabhashya is not his au-

thority in this case either, for it does not mention the Śatyāyanins in its comment on the sūtra in question (iv 3 105). But Kāyāta cites the Brāhmanas proclaimed by Śatyāyana &c, as contemporaneous with the Yājñavalkya, Brāhmanas and Sautraśāstra. For which are mentioned in the Mahābhāṭya (see, however *I St*, v 67, 68) and the Mahābhāṭya itself cites the Śatyāyanins along with the Bhāṭlavins (on iv 2 104) they belonged, it would seem, to the north see *I St*, xii 442.

¹⁰⁰ See on this *I St*, iii 473, xii 439.

of the Kēlapas and Kauthumas, and along with the latter the Laukākshas also. As to the Śākayanins* Śāyākayanins Kalabavins, and Śālankāyanins,¹⁰¹ with whom, as with the Śatyayanins, we are only acquainted through quotations, it is altogether uncertain whether they belong to the Black Yajus or not. The *Chhagalins*, whose name seems to be borne by a tolerably ancient Upanishad in Anquetil's *Oupnekhat*, are stated in the Charanavyūha¹⁰² to form a school of the Black Yajus (according to Pāṇini, iv 3. 109, they are called Chhāgaleyins) the same is there said of the *Śvetāśvataras*. The latter gave their name to an Upanishad composed in a metrical form, and called at its close the work of a Śvetaśvatara in which the Samkhya doctrine of the two primeval principles is mixed up with the Yoga doctrine of one Lord, a strange misuse being here made of wholly irrelevant passages of the Samhitā, &c, of the Yajus, and upon this rests its sole claim to be connected with the latter. Kapila, the originator of the Samkhya system, appears in it raised to divine dignity itself, and it evidently belongs to a very late period, for though several passages from it are quoted in the Brahma-Sūtra of Badaarayana (from which its priority to the latter at least would appear to follow), they may just as well have been borrowed from the common source, the Yajus. It is, at all events, a good deal older than Samkara, since he regarded it as Śruti, and commented upon it. It has recently been published, together with this commentary,* by Dr Roer, in the *Bibliotheca Indica*, vol vii, see also *Ind Stud*, 1 420, ff.—The *Maṇḍūkya Upanishad* at least bears a more ancient name, and might perhaps be connected

* They are mentioned in the tenth book of the Brāhmana of the White Yajus [see also *Kāthaka* 22 7, *I St*, iii 472], as is also Śāyākāyana.

¹⁰¹ The Śālankāyanas are ranked as Brāhmanas among the Vāṇikas in the Calcutta scholium to *Pāṇi* v 3. 114 (*śāṅkya nā vyākhyātām*). *Vyā* as a mother, *Satyavati*, is called Śālankāyanajā, and Pāṇini himself Śālanki, see *I St*, xii 375, 395, 428 429.

¹⁰² This statement needs correc-

tion to this extent, that the Charanavyūha does not know the name Chhagalins at all (which is mentioned by Pāṇini alone) but speaks only of Chhāgeyas or Chhāgaleyas, see *I St*, iii 258 Muller, *A S L* p 370. On Anquetil's 'Trichakh' Upanishad see now *I St*, ix 42-46.

* Distinguished by a great number of sometimes tolerably long quotations from the *Upanishads*, &c (Roer's translation was published in the *Bibl Ind.*, vol xvi.)

with the above-mentioned Maitra (Brahmana) Its text, however, both in language and contents, shows that, compared with the latter, it is of a very modern date At present, unfortunately, I have at my command only the four first *prapāṭhakas*, and these in a very incorrect form,*—whereas in Anquetil's translation, the Upanishad consists of twenty chapters,—yet even these are sufficient clearly to determine the character of the work King Brihadraṭha, who, penetrated by the nothingness of earthly things, resigned the sovereignty into the hands of his son, and devoted himself to contemplation, is there instructed by Śākayanya (see *gana* 'Kūṇja') upon the relation of the *ātman* (soul) to the world, Śākayanya communicates to him what Maitreya had said upon this subject, who in his turn had only repeated the instruction given to the Balaḥkilyas by Prajapati himself The doctrine in question is thus derived at third hand only, and we have to recognise in this tradition a consciousness of the late origin of this form of it This late origin manifests itself externally also in the fact that corresponding passages from other sources are quoted with exceeding frequency in support of the doctrine, introduced by "*athā 'nyatrā 'py uktam*," "*etad apy uktam*," "*atre 'me śloka bhavanti*," "*atha yathe 'yam Kautsāyanastutiḥ*" The ideas themselves are quite upon a level with those of the fully developed Sāṃkhya doctrine,† and the language is completely marked off from the

* I obtained them quite recently, in transcript, through the kindness of Baron d'Eckstein, of Paris, together with the tenth *adhyāya* of a metrical paraphrase, called *Anaḥśu tīprīḍa*, of this Upanishad, extending in 150 *ślokas*, over these four *prapāṭhakas* The latter is copied from E. I. H., 693, and is probably identical with the work of Vidyā ranya often mentioned by Cole brooke [It is really so, and this portion has since been published together with the Upanishad in folio by Cowell, in his edition of the Maitr Upanishad, in seven *prapā ṭhakas*, with Rāmātīrthas commentary and an English translation, in the *Bāl Ind* (1862-70). According

to the commentary, on the one hand, the two last books are to be considered as *khulas*, and on the other the whole Upanishad belongs to a *pāraṅkanda* in four books, of ritual purport, by which most likely is meant the *Mantrāyana* Samhita discussed by Bühler (see *I Śt* xiii 119, ff.), in which the Upanishad is quoted as the second ('*kanda*'), see *I c.*, p. 121 The transcript sent me by Eckstein shows manifold deviations from the other text its original has unfortunately not been discovered yet.]

† Brahman, Rudra, and Vishnu represent respectively the Sattva, the Tamas, and the Rajas elements of Prajapati.

prose of the Brahmanas, both by extremely long compounds, and by words entirely foreign to these, and only belonging to the epic period (such as *surā*, *yaksha*, *arugi*, *bhūtagana*, &c.) The mention also of the *grahas*, planets, and of the motion of the polar star (*dhruvasya prachalanam*), supposes a period considerably posterior to the Brahmana.¹²³ The zodiacal signs are even mentioned in Anquetil's translation, the text to which I have access does not unfortunately extend so far.¹²⁴ That among the princes enumerated in the introduction as having met their downfall, notwithstanding all their greatness, not one name occurs belonging to the narrower legend of the Maha-Bharata or Ramayana, is no doubt simply owing to the circumstance that Brihadratha is regarded as the predecessor of the Pandus. For we have probably to identify him with the Brihadratha, king of Magadha, who according to the Maha-Bharata (II. 756) gave up the sovereignty to his son Jarasandha, afterwards slain by the Pandus, and retired to the wood of penance. I cannot forbear connecting with the instruction here stated to have been given to a king of Magadha by a *Sākāyanya* the fact that it was precisely in Magadha that Buddhism, the doctrine of *Sākāyamuni*, found a welcome. I would even go so far as directly to conjecture that we have here a Brahmanical legend about *Sākāyamuni*, whereas otherwise legends of this kind reach us only through the adherents of the Buddhist doctrine. Maitreya, it is well known, is, with the Buddhists, the name of the future Buddha, yet in their legends the name is also often directly connected with their *Sākāyamuni*, a *Pūrṇa Maitrayaniputra*, too, is given to the latter as a pupil. Indeed, as far as we can judge at

¹²³ According to Cowell (p. 244) by *graha* we have here to understand, once at least (i. 4), not the planets but *śilagrahas* (children's diseases), "*Dhruvasya prachalanam* probably only refers to a *pralaya*, then even 'the never ranging pole star' is forced to move." In a second passage, however (VI. 16, p. 1), as the *grahas* appear along with *ṇ* *ṇon* and the *ṇakṣas*. Very late still, too, is the statement as to the limits of the sun's two

journeys (VI. 14, Cowell, pp. 119, 266), see on this I. II, ix. 363.

¹²⁴ The text has nothing of this (VII. 1, p. 193), but special mention is here made of Saturn, *śani* (p. 201), and where *śukra* occurs (p. 200) we might perhaps think of Venus. This last *adhyāya* throughout clearly betrays its later origin of special interest is the bitter polemic against heretics and unbelievers (p. 205).

present, the doctrine of this Upanishad stands in close connection with the opinions of the Buddhists,¹⁰⁵ although from its Brahmanical origin it is naturally altogether free from the dogma and mythology peculiar to Buddhism. We may here also notice, especially, the contempt for writing (*grantha*) exhibited in one of the *ślohas** quoted in corroboration.

Neither the Chhagalins, nor the Svetāśvataras, nor the Maitrayaniyas are mentioned in the Sūtras of the other Vedas, or in similar works, as schools of the Black Yajus, still, we must certainly ascribe to the last mentioned a very active share in its development, and the names Maitreya and Maitreyī at least are not unfrequently quoted in the Brahmanas.

In the case of the *Sutras*, too, belonging to the Black Yajus, the large number of different schools is very striking. Although, as in the case of the Brahmanas, we only know the greater part of them through quotations there is reason to expect, not only that the remarkably rich collection of the India House (with which I am only very superficially acquainted) will be found to contain many treasures in this department, but also that many of them will yet be recovered in India itself. The Berlin collection does not contain a single one. In the first place, as to the *Śrauta-Sutras*, my only knowledge of the *Katha-Sutra*,† the *Maṇu-Sutra*, the *Mantra-Sūtra*, and the *Āngīrśi-Sutra* is derived from the commentaries on the Kātyāyana-Sūtra of the White Yajus, the second, however,¹⁰⁶ stands in the catalogue of the Fort-William col-

¹⁰⁵ Bāṇa's Harabacharitra informs us of a Maitrāyaṇīya Divākara who embraced the Buddhist creed, and Bhāu Dāyī (*Journal Bombay Branch R. A. S.* x. 40) adds that even now Maitr. Brahmins live near Bhadrācāra at the foot of the Vindhya, with whom other Brahmins do not eat in common, 'the reason may have been the early Buddhist tendencies of many of them.'

* Which by the way, recurs together with some others in precisely the same form in the Amṛtavinīḍa (or Brahmanavīḍa) Upanishad [Though it may be very doubtful

whether the word *grantha* ought really *a priori* and for the earlier period to be understood of written texts (cf. *I St.* xiii. 476), yet in this verse at any rate a different interpretation is hardly possible, see below.]

† Langākṣa and the *Lāṃādyānandya Brāhmanam* are said to be quoted therein.

¹⁰⁶ On this, as well as on the contents and the division of the work, see my remarks in *I St.* v. 13-16, in accordance with communications received from Professor Cowell, cf. also Haug *ibid.*, ix. 175. A *Lāṃādyā*

lection, and of the last, whose author is cited in the *Katha-Sūtra*, as well as in the *Kāṭiya-Sūtra*, there is, it appears, a copy in Vienna. Mahādeva, a commentator of the *Kalpa-Sūtra* of Satyāśhadha Hiranyakeśi, when enumerating the *Taittirīya-Sūtras* in successive order in his introduction, leaves out these four altogether, and names at the head of his list the *Sūtra* of *Baudhāyana* as the oldest, then that of *Bhāradvāja*, next that of *Āpastamba*, next that of *Hiranyakeśi* himself, and finally two names not otherwise mentioned in this connection, *Vādhūna* and *Vaikhānasa*, the former of which is perhaps a corrupted form. Of these names, *Bhāradvāja* is the only one to be found in Vedic works, it appears in the *Brāhmaṇa* of the White Yajus, especially in the supplements to the *Vrihad-Āraṇyaka* (where several persons of this name are mentioned), in the *Kāṭiya-Sūtra* of the same Yajus, in the *Pratīśākhya-Sūtra* of the Black Yajus, and in Pāṇini. Though the name is a patronymic, yet it is possible that these last citations refer to one and the same person, in which case he must at the same time be regarded as the founder of a grammatical school, that of the *Bhāradvājīyas*. As yet, I have seen nothing of his *Sūtra*, and am acquainted with it only through quotations. According to a statement by the Mahādeva just mentioned, it treats of the oblation to the Manes, in two *prāśnas*, and therefore shares with the rest of the *Sūtras* this designation of the sections, which is peculiar to the Black Yajus¹⁰⁷. The *Sūtra* of *Āpastamba* * is found in the Library of the India House, and a part of it in Paris also. Commentaries on it by

Srauta Sūtra is also cited in Bühler's *Catalogue of MSS from Gujarat*, i. 188 (1871), it is in 322 foll. The manuscript edited in facsimile by Goldstücker under the title, '*Mānava Kalpa-Sūtra, being a portion of this ancient work on Vaidik rites to gether with the Commentary of Kumārilaśarmā*' (1861), gives but little of the text, the commentary quoting only the first words of the passages commented upon. Whether the concluding words '*Kumārilaśarmā*' really indicate that

Kumārilaśarmā was the author of the commentary seems still doubtful.

¹⁰⁷ The *Bhāradvājīya Sūtra* has now been discovered by Bühler, see his *Catal. of MSS from Guj.* i. 186 (212 foll.), the *Vaikhānasa Sūtra* is also quoted at l. 190 (292 foll.), see also Haug in *I. St.* ix. 175.

* According to the quotations, the *Vājasmeyika*, *Balyrica Brāhmaṇa*, and *Sātyāyanaka* are frequently mentioned therein.

Dhūrtasvāmin and Tālavrintanivasin are mentioned,¹⁰⁸ also one on the Sūtra of Baudhāyana by Kapardisvāmin¹⁰⁹ The work of Satyashadha contains, according to Mahadeva's statement,¹¹⁰ twenty-seven *prāśnas*, whose contents agree pretty closely with the order followed in the Kātyā-Sūtra, only the last nine form an exception, and are quite peculiar to it. The nineteenth and twentieth *prāśnas* refer to domestic ceremonies, which usually find a place in the Grihya- and Smārta-Sūtras. In the twenty-first, genealogical accounts and lists are contained, as also in a *prāśna* of the Baudhāyana-Sūtra.*

Still scantier is the information we possess upon the Grihya-Sūtras of the Black Yajus. The *Kāṣhala* Grihya-Sūtra is known to me only through quotations, as are also the Sūtras of *Baudhāyana* (extant in the Fort-William

¹⁰⁸ On the Āpastamba-Śrauta-Sūtra and the commentaries belonging to it, by Dhūrtasv, Kapardisvāmin, Rudrādāta, Gurudevāsvāmin, Karavindasvāmin, Tālav, Ahobalasuri (Ādābāli in Bühler, l. c. p. 150, who also mentions a Nṛsiṃha, p. 152), and others, see Burnell in his *Catalogue*, pp. 18-24, and in the *Indian Antiquary*, 1. 5. 6. According to this the work consists of thirty *prāśnas*, the first twenty three treat of the sacrificial rites in essentially the same order (from *darśapurnamāsa* to *sattvīdyanam*) as in Hiranyakeśi, whose Sūtra generally is almost identical with that of Āpastamba, see Bühler's preface to the *Āp. Dharma-Sūtra*, p. 6, the 24th *prāśna* contains the general rules, *parīkṣāśāśa*, edited by M. Müller in *Z. D. M. G.*, 12. (1855), a *pravara-khanda* and a *hautra*, *prāśnas* 25-27 contain the Grihya-Sūtra, *prāśnas* 28-29 the Dharma-Sūtra, edited by Bühler (1868), and finally, *prāśna* 30, the Śulva-Sūtra (*śulva*, 'measuring cord').

¹⁰⁹ On the Baudhāyana Sūtra compare likewise Burnell's *Catalogue*, pp. 24-30. Bhavasvāmin, who amongst others commented it, is mentioned by Bhaṭṭa Bhāskara, and is consequently placed by Burnell (p. 26) in

the eighth century. According to Kielhorn, *Catalogue of MSS in the South Division of the Bombay Pres.*, p. 8 there exists a commentary on it by Śāyana also, for whom indeed, it constituted the special text-book of the Yajus school to which he belonged, see Burnell, *Vaṅśa Brāhmaṇa*, pp. ix-xix. In Bühler's *Catalogue of MSS from Guy*, 1. 182, 184, Anantadeva, Navahasta, and Śeṣha are also quoted as scholiasts. The exact compass of the entire work is not yet ascertained. The Baudhāyana Dharma Sūtra, which, according to Bühler, *Digest of Hindu Law*, 1. p. xxi. (1867) forms part of the Śrauta-Sūtra, as in the case of Āpastamba and Hiranyakeśi, was commented by Govindasvāmin, see Burnell, p. 35.

¹¹⁰ Mātridatta and Vāṇīkeśvara (ṣ) are also mentioned as commentators, see Kielhorn, l. c. p. 10.

* Such lists are also found in Āśvalāyana's work at the end, though only in brief for the Kātyā Sūtra, a *Parīkṣā* comes in. [*Prāśnas* 26, 27, of Hiranyakeśi treat of dharmas, so that here also as in the case of Āpast and Baudh., the Dharma-Sūtra forms part of the Śrauta Sūtra.]

collection), of *Bhāradvāja*, and of *Satyás'addha*, or *Hiranyakeśi*, unless in this latter case only the corresponding *prāśnas* of the *Kalpa-Sūtra* are intended.¹¹¹ I have myself only glanced through a *Paddhati* of the *Grihya-Sūtra* of the *Maitrāyaṇīya* school, which treats of the usual subject (the sixteen *samśkāras*, or sacraments) I conclude that there must also have been a *Grihya-Sūtra*¹¹² of the *Mānava* school from the existence of the Code bearing that name,¹¹³ just as the Codes ascribed to *Atri*, *Āpastamba*, *Chhagaleya*, *Baudhayana*, *Laugākṣhi*, and *Satyayana* are probably to be traced to the schools of the same name belonging to the Black Yajus, that is to say, to their *Grihya-Sūtras*.¹¹⁴

Lastly, the *Pratīśākhya-Sūtra* has still to be mentioned as a *Sūtra* of the Black Yajus. The only manuscript with which I am acquainted unfortunately only begins at the fourth section of the first of the two *prāśnas*. This work is of special significance from the number of very peculiar names of teachers * mentioned in it as *Ātreya*, *Kaundinya* (once by the title of *Sthavira*), and *Bharadvāja*, whom we know already, also *Valmiki*, a name which in this connection is especially surprising, and further *Āgurveśya*, *Āgurveśyayana*, *Paushkarasadi*, and others. The two last names, as well as that of *Kaundinya*,† are mentioned in Buddhist writings as the names either of pupils or of contemporaries of Buddha and *Paushkarasadi* is also cited in the *vārttikas* to *Pāṇini* by *Katyayana*, their author. Again, the allusion occurring here for the first time to the *Mīmāṃsakas* and *Taittirīyakas* deserves to be remarked,

¹¹¹ This is really so. On *Āpastamba* and *Bhāradvāja* *Grihyas* see *Burnell, Catalogue* pp 30-33. The sections of two 'prayogas' of both texts, relating to birth ceremonial, have been edited by *Speiser* in his book *De Ceremonia apud Indos quæ vocatur yajakarma* (Leyden, 1872).

¹¹² It is actually extant: see *Buhler Catalogue*, i. 133 (2o foll.) and *Kiehnorn, I c.*, p. 10 (fragment).

¹¹³ *Johāntgen* in his valuable tract *Ueber das Geschick des Manu* (1853), p. 109 ff. has, from the geographical data in *Manu*, ii. 17 ff. traced the territory between the *Dra*

śadvati and *Sarasvati* as the proper home of the *Mānavas*. This appears somewhat too strict. At any rate, the statements as to the extent of the *Madhveśya* which are found in the *Pratīśākhya* of the White Yajus point us for the latter more to the east, see my essay *Ueber das Pratyak-Sūtra* (1872), pp. 101, 105.

¹¹⁴ See *Johāntgen, I c.*, p. 108, 109.

* Their number is twenty: see *Roth, Der Lat. und Germ.*, pp. 65, 66.

† See *I St.*, i. 44; not. [xii 387, ff., 415].

also the contradistinction, found at the close of the work, of *Chhandas* and *Bhāshā*, i.e., of Vedic and ordinary language.¹¹⁵ The work appears also to extend to a portion of the Aranyaka of the Black Yajus, whether to the whole cannot yet be ascertained, and is scarcely probable.¹¹⁶

In conclusion, I have to notice the two *Anukramanī*s already mentioned, the one belonging to the Ātreya school, the other to the Charayaniya school of the Kathaka. The former¹¹⁷ deals almost exclusively with the contents of the several sections, which it gives in their order. It consists of two parts. The first, which is in prose, is a mere nomenclature, the second, in thirty-four *ślokas*, is little more. It, however, gives a few particulars besides as to the transmission of the text. To it is annexed a commentary upon both parts, which names each section, together with its opening words and extent. The *Anukramanī* of the Kathaka enters but little into the contents, it limits itself, on the contrary, to giving the *Rishis* of the various sections as well as of the separate verses, and here, in the case of the pieces taken from the *Rik*, it not unfrequently exhibits considerable divergence from the statements given in the *Anukramanī* of the latter, citing, in particular, a number of entirely new names. According to the concluding statement, it is the work of Atri, who imparted it to Laugakshi.

We now turn to the *White Yajus*.

With regard, in the first place, to the name itself, it probably refers, as has been already remarked, to the fact that the sacrificial formulas are here separated from their

¹¹⁵ In the passage in question (xxiv 5), '*Chhandobhāshā*' means rather 'the Veda language,' see Whitney, p. 417.

¹¹⁶ We have now an excellent edition of the work by Whitney, *Journal Am. Or. Soc.*, ix. (1871), text, translation, and notes, together with a commentary called *Triśiṣṭyāraṇa*, by an anonymous author (or is his name Kārttikeya?), a compilation from three older commentaries by Ātreya, Māhishaya, and Vararuchi.—No reference to the Taitt

Ar or Taitt. Brāhma. is made in the text itself, on the contrary, it confines itself exclusively to the Taitt. S. The commentary, however, in some few instances goes beyond the T. S., see Whitney a special discussion of the points here involved, pp. 422-426. cf. also *I. S.*, iv 76-79.

¹¹⁷ See *I. S.*, iii 373-401, iii 350-357, and the similar statements from Bhatta Bhāskara Miśra in Bunnell's *Catalogue*, p. 24. The Ātreya text here appears in a special relation to a *śāraṇa* *paṭha*.

ritual basis and dogmatical explanation, and that we have here a systematic and orderly distribution of the matter so confusedly mixed up in the Black Yajus. This is the way in which the expression *śuklāni yajunshī* is explained by the commentator Driveda Gaṅga, in the only passage where up till now it has been found in this sense, namely, in the last supplement added to the Vṛihad-Āraṇyaka of the White Yajus. I say in the only passage, for though it appears once under the form *śukrayajunshī*, in the Āraṇyaka of the Black Yajus (5. 10), it has hardly the same general meaning there, but probably refers, on the contrary, to the fourth and fifth books of that Āraṇyaka itself. For in the Anukramapī of the Ātreya school these books bear the name *śukriyakānda*, because referring to expiatory ceremonies; and this name *śukriya*, 'expiating' [probably rather 'illuminating' ?] belongs also to the corresponding parts of the Samhitā of the White Yajus, and even to the *sāmans* employed at these particular sacrifices.

Another name of the White Yajus is derived from the surname Vājasaneyā, which is given to Yājñavalkya, the teacher who is recognised as its author, in the supplement to the Vṛihad-Āraṇyaka, just mentioned. Mahidhara, at the commencement of his commentary on the Samhitā of the White Yajus, explains Vajasaneyā as a patronymic, "the son of Vajasani." Whether this be correct, or whether the word *vājasani* is to be taken as an appellative, it at any rate signifies "the giver of food," and refers to the chief object lying at the root of all sacrificial ceremonies, the obtaining of the necessary food from the gods whom the sacrifices are to propitiate. To this is also to be traced the name *vājan*, "having food," by which the theologians of the White Yajus are occasionally distinguished.¹² Now, from Vājasaneyā are derived two forms of words by which the Samhitā and Brahmana of the White Yajus are found

* In Mahā-Bhārata, III. 1507, the word is an epithet of Kṛishṇa [Here also it is explained as above, for the Rik, however according to the St. Petersburg Dictionary, we have to assign to it the meaning of 'procuring courage or strength, victorious gaining booty or prize'. The explanation of the word *vājan*

by 'food' (*anna*) is probably purely a scholastic one.]

¹² According to another explanation, this is because the Sun as Horse revealed to Yājñavalkya the *aydyajdmanamundai yajūshī*, see Vishnu Purāṇa, II. 5. 28, "swift, courageous, horse" are the fundamental meanings of the word.

cited, namely, *Vājasaneyaka*, first used in the Taittiriya-Sūtra of Āpastamba and the Kātya-Sūtra of the White Yajus itself, and *Vājasaneyinas*,* i.e., those who study the two works in question, first used in the Anupada-Sūtra of the Samaveda.

In the White Yajus we find, what does not occur in the case of any other Veda, that Samhita and Brahmana have been handed down in their entirety in two distinct recensions, and thus we obtain a measure for the mutual relations of such schools generally. These two recensions agree almost entirely in their contents, as also in the distribution of them, in the latter respect, however, there are many, although slight, discrepancies. The chief difference consists partly in actual variants in the sacrificial formulas, as in the Brahmana, and partly in orthographic or orthoepic peculiarities. One of these recensions bears the name of the *Kānvas*, the other that of the *Mādhyamdinas*, names which have not yet been found in the Sūtras or similar writings. The only exception is the Pratiśakhya-Sūtra of the White Yajus itself, where there is mention both of a Kānva and of the *Mādhyamdinas*. In the supplement to the Vṛihad-Āraṇyaka again, in the lists of teachers, a Kānviputra (vi 5 1) and a Mādhyamdinayana (iv 6 2) at least are mentioned, although only in the Kānva recension, not in the other, the former being cited among the latest, the latter among the more recent members of the respective lists. The question now arises whether the two recensions are to be regarded as contemporary, or if one is older than the other. It is possible to adopt the latter view, and to consider the Kānva school as the older one. For not only is Kānva the name of one of the ancient Rishi families of the R̥gveda—and with the R̥gveda this recension agrees in the peculiar notation of the cerebral *d* by *l*—but the remaining literature of the White Yajus appears to connect itself rather with the school of the Mādhyamdinas. However this may be,¹¹² we cannot, at

* Occurs in the gōṣa 'Gaunaka.' [The *Vājasaneyaka* is also quoted by *Lāṭyāyana*.]

¹¹² The *Mādhyamdinas* are not mentioned in Pītampajih's *Mahābhāṣya*, but the *Kānvas*, the *Kān*

vāta, a yellow (*paṇḍala*) Kānva, and a Kānvyāyan, and also their pupils, are mentioned, see *J. St.*, xiii. 417, 444. The school of the *Kānvas* Śaunakā is mentioned in the *Kāṭhaka*, see on this *J. St.*, in. 475.

any rate, assume anything like a long interval between the two recensions, they resemble each other too closely for this, and we should perhaps do better to regard their distinction as a geographical one, orthoëpic divergencies generally being best explained by geographical reasons. As to the exact date to be ascribed to these recensions, it may be, as has already been stated in our general survey, (p 10), that we have here historical ground to go upon—a thing which so seldom happens in this field. Arrian, quoting from Megasthenes, mentions a people called *Μαδωνδῖοι*, “through whose country flows the river Andromati,” and I have ventured to suggest that we should understand by these the *Mādhyamdinas*,¹²⁰ after whom one of these schools is named, and that therefore this school was either then already in existence, or else grew up at that time or soon afterwards * The matter cannot indeed be looked upon as certain, for this reason, that *mādhyamdina*, ‘southern,’ might apply in general to any southern people or any southern school, and, as a matter of fact, we find mention of *mādhyamdina-Kauthumās*, ‘southern Kauthumas’ † In the main, however, this date suits so perfectly that the conjecture is at least not to be rejected offhand. From this, of course, the question of the time of origin of the White Yajus must be strictly separated, it can only be solved from the evidence contained in the

and in the *Āpastamba Dharma Sūtra* also reference is sometimes made to a teacher *Kapva* or *Kāva*. *Kapva* and *Kāva* appear further in the *prasaṅga* sect of *Āśvalāyana*, and in *Pāṇini* himself (iv 2 111), &c

¹²⁰ The country of the *Μαδωνδῖοι* is situate precisely in the middle of that ‘*Mādhyadeśa*’ the limits of which are given in the *Pratijñā Parīkṣā*, see my paper *Ueber das Pratijñā-Sūtra*, pp. 101–105

* Whether, in that case, we may assume that all the works now comprised in the *Mādhyamdina* school had already a place in this redaction is a distinct question. [An interesting remark of Müller’s, *Hist. A. S. L.*, p. 453, points out that the *Goatula-Brahmana* in citing the first words of the different Vedas (i. 29),

quotes in the case of the *Yajurveda* the beginning of the *Vājas S.*, and not that of the *Taitt. S.* (or *Kāth.*)]

† [*Vindhyaka* designates his *Kaushitaki Brāhmaṇa Bhāṣya* as *Mādhyamdina Kauthumānugama*, but does he not here mean the two schools so called (*Mādhy* and *Kauth*)? They appear, in like manner, side by side in an inscription published by Hall, *Journal Am. Or. Soc.*, vi. 539.] In the *Kāśikā* (to *Pāṇ.* vi. 1 94) a grammarian, *Mādhyamdina*, is mentioned as a pupil of *Vyākṛapāda* (*Vyākṛapadda varāṣṭakā*), see Böhtlingk, *Pāṇini*, introd. p. 1. On this it is to be remarked, that in the *Brāhmaṇa* two *Vālyāḍhṛapādya*s and one *Vālyāḍhṛapadiputra* are mentioned.

work itself. Here our special task consists in separating the different portions of it, which in its present form are bound up in one whole. Fortunately we have still data enough here to enable us to determine the priority or posteriority of the several portions.

In the first place, as regards the Samhita of the White Yajus, the *Vájasaneyi-Samhita*, it is extant in both recensions in 40 *adhyáyas*. In the Madhyamdina recension these are divided into 303 *anurákas* and 1975 *handiles*. The first 25 *adhyáyas* contain the formulas for the general sacrificial ceremonial,¹²¹ first (i, ii) for the new and full-moon sacrifice, then (iii) for the morning and evening fire sacrifice, as well as for the sacrifices to be offered every four months at the commencement of the three seasons, next (iv-viii) for the Soma sacrifice in general, and (ix, x) for two modifications of it, next (xi-xviii) for the construction of altars for sacred fires, next (xix-xxi) for the *sautránti*, a ceremony originally appointed to expiate the evil effects of too free indulgence in the Soma drink, and lastly (xxii-xxv) for the horse sacrifice. The last seven of these *adhyáyas* may possibly be regarded as a later addition to the first eighteen. At any rate it is certain that the last fifteen *adhyáyas* which follow them are of later, and possibly of considerably later, origin. In the Anukramanī of the White Yajus which bears the name of Katyayana, as well as in a *Paríśiṣṭa*¹²² to it and subsequently also in Mahādhara's commentary on the Samhita, xxvi-xxv are expressly called a *Khila*, or supplement, and xxxvi-xl, *Sukriya*, a name above explained. This statement the commentary on the Code of Yajnavalkya (called *Mitakshara*) modifies to this effect, that the *Sukriya* begins at xxx. 3, and that xxxvi. 1 forms the beginning of an *Āraṇyaka*.^{*} The first four of these later added *adhyáyas* (xxvi-xxix) contain sacrificial formulas which belong to the ceremonies treated of in the earlier *adhyáyas*, and

¹²¹ A comprehensive but condensed exposition of it has been commenced in my papers *Zur Kenntnis des vedischen Opferrituals*, in *I St.*, i. 321-396, xii. 217-292.

¹²² See my paper *Ueber das Praetend Sātra* (1872), pp. 102-105.

* That a portion of these last books is to be considered as an *Āraṇyaka* seems to be beyond doubt, for xxxvii-xxxix, in particular this is certain, as they are explained in the *Āraṇyaka* part of the *Brahma*.

must be supplied thereto in the proper place. The ten following *adhyāyas* (xxx-xxxix) contain the formulas for entirely new sacrificial ceremonies, viz., the *puruṣa-medha* (human sacrifice),¹²³ the *sarva-medha* (universal sacrifice) the *pitṛ-medha* (oblation to the Manes), and the *pravarṇya* (purificatory sacrifice).¹²⁴ The last *adhyāya*, finally, has no sort of direct reference to the sacrificial ceremonial. It is also regarded as an Upanishad * and is professedly designed to fix the proper mean between those exclusively engaged in sacrificial acts and those entirely neglecting them. It belongs at all events to a very advanced stage of speculation, as it assumes a Lord (Īś) of the universe.†—Independently of the above-mentioned external testimony to the later origin of these fifteen *adhyāyas*, their posteriority is sufficiently proved by the relation in which they stand both to the Black Yajus and to their own Brahmanas, as well as by the data they themselves contain. In the Taittiriya-Samhita only those formulas appear which are found in the first eighteen *adhyāyas*, together with a few of the *mantras* belonging to the horse sacrifice, the remainder of the latter, together with the *mantras* belonging to the *sautrāmanī* and the human sacrifice, are only treated of in the Taittiriya Brahmanas, and those for the universal and the purificatory sacrifices as well as those for oblations to the Manes, only in the Taittiriya-Āraṇyaka. In like manner, the first eighteen *adhyāyas* are cited in full, and explained word by word in the first nine books of the Brahmana of the White Yajus, but only a few of the formulas for the *sautrāmanī*, the horse sacrifice, human sacrifice, universal

¹²³ See my essay, *Ueber Menschenopfer bei den Indern der vedischen Zeit*, in *I. Str.*, i. 54, ff.

¹²⁴ This translation of the word *pravarṇya* is not a literal one (for this see the St. Petersburg Dict., under root *var* with prep. *pra*) but is borrowed from the sense and purpose of the ceremony in question. The latter is, according to Haug on *Art. Brāhmaṇa*, i. 18, p. 42, a preparatory rite intended for providing the sacrificer with a heavenly body with which alone he is permitted to enter the residence of the gods.

* Other parts, too, of the Veda. B. have in later times been looked upon as Upanishads: for example, the sixteenth book (*Sata-rudriya*), the thirty first (*Puruṣa-sūkta*), thirty-second (*Tadras*) and the beginning of the thirty-fourth book (*Śivasūkta*).

† According to Mahidhara's commentary, its polemic is directed partially against the Buddhists, the is, probably against the doctrines which afterwards were called *Sikṣā*.

sacrifice, and oblation to the Manes (vix.-xxxv) are cited in the twelfth and thirteenth books, and that for the most part only by their initial words, or even merely by the initial words of the *anurālas*, without any sort of explanation, and it is only the three last *adhyāyas* but one (xxxvii.-xxxix) which are again explained word by word, in the beginning of the fourteenth book. In the case of the *mantras*, but slightly referred to by their initial words, explanation seems to have been considered unnecessary, probably because they were still generally understood, we have, therefore, of course, no guarantee that the writer of the Brahmana had them before him in the form which they bear at present. As to those *mantras*, on the contrary, which are not mentioned at all, the idea suggests itself that they may not yet have been incorporated into the Samhita text extant when the Brahmana was composed. They are, roughly speaking, of two kinds. First, there are strophes borrowed from the Rik, and to be recited by the Hotar, which therefore, strictly speaking, ought not to be contained in the Yajus at all, and of which it is possible that the Brahmana may have taken no notice, for the reason that it has nothing to do with the special duties of the Hotar, *eg*, in the twentieth, thirty-third, and thirty-fourth *adhyāyas* especially. Secondly, there are passages of a Brahmana type, which are not, however, intended, as in the Black Yajus, to serve as an explanation of *mantras* preceding them, but stand independently by themselves, *eg*, in particular, several passages in the nineteenth *adhyāya*, and the enumeration, in the form of a list, of the animals to be dedicated at the horse sacrifice, in the twenty-fourth *adhyāya*. In the first eighteen *adhyāyas* also, there occur a few sacrificial formulas which the Brahmana either fails to mention (and which, therefore, at the time when it was composed, did not form part of the Samhita), or else cites only by their initial words, or even merely by the initial words of the *anurālas*. But this only happens in the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth *adhyāyas*, though here with tolerable frequency, evidently because these *adhyāyas* themselves bear more or less the character of a Brahmana.—With regard, lastly, to the data contained in the last *adhyāyas*, and testifying to their posteriority, these

are to be sought more especially in the thirtieth and thirty-ninth *adhyāyas*, as compared with the sixteenth. It is, of course, only the Yajus portions proper which can here be adduced, and not the verses borrowed from the Rik-Samhita, which naturally prove nothing in this connection. At most they can only yield a sort of measure for the time of their incorporation into the Yajus, in so far as they may be taken from the latest portions of the Rik, in which case the existence of these at that period would necessarily be presupposed. The data referred to consist in two facts. First, whereas in the sixteenth book Rudra, as the god of the blazing fire is endowed with a large number of the epithets subsequently applied to Śiva, two very significant epithets are here wanting which are applied to him in the thirty-ninth book, viz, *śāna* and *mahādeva*, names probably indicating some kind of sectarian worship (see above, p. 45). Secondly, the number of the mixed castes given in the thirtieth is much higher than that given in the sixteenth book. Those mentioned in the former can hardly all have been in existence at the time of the latter, or we should surely have found others specified besides those that are actually mentioned.

Of the forty books of the Samhita the sixteenth and thirtieth are those which bear most distinctly the stamp of the time to which they belong. The sixteenth book, on which, in its Taittiriya form, the honour was afterwards bestowed of being regarded as an Upanishad, and as the principal book of the Śiva sects, treats of the propitiation of Rudra, and (see *I St.*, ii 22, 24-26) by its enumeration and distinction of the many different kinds of thieves, robbers, murderers, night-brawlers, and highwaymen, his supposed servants, reveals to us a time of insecurity and violence. Its mention, too, of various mixed castes indicates that the Indian caste system and polity were already fully developed. Now as in the nature of things these were not established without vigorous opposition from those who were thrust down into the lower castes and as this opposition must have manifested itself chiefly in feuds open or secret, with their oppressors, I am inclined to suppose that this Rudra book dates from the time of these secret feuds on the part of the conquered aborigines, as well as of the Vratyas or unbrahmanised Aryans after

their open resistance had been more or less crushed¹²⁵ At such a time, the worship of a god who passes as the prototype of terror and fury is quite intelligible—The thirtieth book, in enumerating the different classes of persons to be dedicated at the *purusha-medha*, gives the names of most of the Indian mixed castes, whence we may at any rate conclude that the complete consolidation of the Brahmanical polity had then been effected. Some of the names here given are of peculiar interest. So, for example, the *māgadha*, who is dedicated in y 5 "*atikrushṭāya*" The question arises, What is to be understood by *māgadha*? If we take *atikrushṭa* in the sense of "great noise," the most obvious interpretation of *māgadha* is to understand it with Mahidhara, in its epic sense, as signifying a minstrel,* son of a Vaiśya by a Kshatriya. This agrees excellently with the dedications immediately following (in v 6), of the *suta* to the dance, and of the *śarlūsha* to song, though not so well, it must be admitted, with the dedications immediately preceding, of the *klība* (eunuch), the *ayogu* (gambler?), and the *punśchalu* (harlot). The *māgadha* again appears in their company in v 22† and they cannot be said to throw the best light upon his moral character a circumstance which is certainly surprising considering the position held by this caste in the epic, though, on the other hand, in India also, musicians, dancers, and singers (*śarlushas*) have not at any time enjoyed the best reputation. But another interpretation of the word *māgadha* is possible‡ In the fifteenth, the

¹²⁵ By the Buddhist author Yaśomitra, scholast of the Abhidharmaśāstra, the Śātarudrīya is stated to be a work by Vyāsa against Buddhism whence, however, we have probably to conclude only that it passed for and was used as a principal support for Śiva worship especially in its detached form as a separate Upanishad see Burnouf's *Introduction à l'Histoire du Bouddhisme* p 563, I St. ii 22

* How he comes by this name is, it is true not clear

† Here however the *klība* is put instead of the *ayogu*, and be

sides, an express condition is laid down that the four must belong neither to the Sudra nor to the Brāhmana caste [By *ayogu* may also be meant an uchuaste woman, see I Str 1 76]

‡ Śāyana commenting on the corresponding passage of the Taitt. Brāhmana (iii 4 1) explains the word *atikrushṭāya* by *atimandita devdya* "dedicated to the very Blameworthy as his deity [in Rājendra Lalā Mitra's edition p 347] this very Blameworthy it is true might also refer to the bad moral reputation of the minstrels.

so called Vratya book* of the Atharva-Samhita, the Vratya (i.e., the Indian living outside of the pale of Brahmanism) is brought into very special relation to the *punśchali* and the *māgadha*, faith is called his harlot, the *mitra* (friend?) his *māgadha*, and similarly the dawn, the earth (?), the lightning his harlots, the *mantra* (formula), *hava* (scorn?) the thunder his *māgadhas*. Owing to the obscurity of the Vratya book, the proper meaning of this passage is not altogether clear, and it is possible, therefore, that here also the dissolute minstrel might be intended. Still the connection set forth in the Sama-Sūtras of Ityāyana and Drāhyayana, as well as in the corresponding passage of the Kāṭiya-Sūtra between the Vratyas and the *māgadhadēsiya brahmabandhu*,¹²⁰ and the hatred with which the Magadhas are elsewhere (see Roth, p. 38) spoken of in the Atharva-Samhita, both lead us to interpret the *māgadha* of the Vratya book as an heretical teacher. For the passages, also, which we are more immediately discussing, this interpretation vies with the one already given, and it seems, in particular, to be favoured by the express direction in v. 22, that "the *māgadha*, the harlot, the gambler, and the eunuch" must neither be Śūdras nor Brahmans,—an injunction which would be entirely superfluous for the *māgadha* at least, supposing him to represent a mixed caste, but which is quite appropriate if the word signifies "a native of the country Magadha." If we adopt this latter interpretation, it follows that heretical (i.e., Buddhist) opinions must have existed in Magadha at the time of the composition of this thirtieth adhyāya. Meanwhile, however, the question which of these two interpretations is the better one remains, of course, unsolved.—The mention of the *nakṣātradarśa*, "star-gazer," in v. 10, and of the

* Translated by Aufrecht, *I St.*, l. 130, ff. (The St. Petersburg Dict., s. v., considers "the praise of the Vratya in Ath. xv as an idealizing of the devout vagrant or mendicant (*parivrajaka*, &c.)," the fact of his being specially connected with the *punśchali* and the *māgadha* remains nevertheless, very strange, and even with this interpretation leads us to surmise suggestions of Buddhism.)

¹²⁰ In the very same way, the

Māgadha—explained by Bīṣṇa as *Māgadhadēsiya*—*brahmabandhu*—is contemptuously introduced by the Sūtrakāra (probably Baudhāyana?) to T. S., vi. 3. 9. 4, in association with a *punśchali*, see *I St.*, in 330.—That there were good Brahmans also in Magadha appears from the name *Māgadharat*, which is given to Prīṭhivīśūtra, the second son of Hrasva Māgādēya, in Śiṣhī Ar., vii. 14.

yanaka, "calculator," in v 20, permits us, at all events, to conclude that astronomical *et*, astrological, science was then actively pursued. It is to it that, according to Mahidhara at least, the "questions" repeatedly mentioned in v 10 relate, although Sayana, perhaps more correctly, thinks that they refer to the usual disputations of the Brahmans. The existence, too, of the so-called Vedic quinquennial cycle is apparent from the fact that in v 15 (only in xxvii. 45 besides) the five names of its years are enumerated, and this supposes no inconsiderable proficiency in astronomical observation¹²⁷—A barren wife is dedicated in v 15 to the Atharvans, by which term Sayana understands the imprecatory and magical formulas bearing the name Atharvan, to which, therefore, one of their intended effects, barrenness, is here dedicated. If this be the correct explanation, it necessarily follows that Atharvan-songs existed at the time of the thirtieth book.—The names of the three dice in v 18 (*kṛita*, *trelā*, and *dvāpara*) are explained by Sayana, commenting on the corresponding passage of the Taittiriya-Brahmana, as the names of the epic *yugas*, which are identical with these—a supposition which will not hold good here, though it may, perhaps, in the case of the Taittiriya Brāhmana*—The hostile reference to the Charakāchārya in v 18 has already been touched upon (p 87)¹²⁸

In the earlier books there are two passages in particular which give an indication of the period from which they date. The first of these exists only in the Kānva recension, where it treats of the sacrifice at the consecration of the king. The text in the Madhyamdina recension (ix 40, x 18) runs as follows: "This is your king, O ye So and So," where, instead of the name of the people, only the indefinite pronoun *am* is used, whereas in the Kānva

¹²⁷ Since *samvatsara* is here mentioned twice, at the beginning and at the end, possibly we have here to do with a sexennial cycle even (cf T Br., iii 10. 4. 1), see my paper *Die vedischen Nachrichten von den Nakshatra*, ii. 298 (1862). The earliest allusion to the quinquennial *yuga* occurs in the Rik itself, iii 55. 18 (l. 25. 8).

* Where moreover the fourth name, *kālā*, is found instead of the *śakanda* given here (see I Str., i. 82).

¹²⁸ Sayana on T Br., iii 4. 16, p. 361 explains (') the word by 'teacher of the art of dancing on the point of a bamboo,' but the *van anartta* is introduced separately in v 25 (T Br., iii. 4. 17).

recension we read (xi 3 3 6 3) "This is your king O ye Kurus O ye Pañchālas."* The second passage occurs in connection with the horse sacrifice (xaiu 18) The *mahishī*, or principal wife of the king, performing this sacrifice, must, in order to obtain a son, pass the night by the side of the horse that has been immolated, placing its *śiśna* on her *upastha*, with her fellow-wives, who are forced to accompany her, she pours forth her sorrow in this lament "O Ambā, O Ambikā, O Ambalikā, no one takes me (by force to the horse), (but if I go not of myself), the (spiteful) horse will lie with (another, as) the (wicked) Subhadra who dwells in Kāmpīla.† Kāmpīla is a town in the country of the Pañchālas Subhadra, therefore, would seem to be the wife of the king of that district,‡ and the benefits of the *āśvamedha* sacrifice are supposed to accrue to them, unless the *mahishī* consents voluntarily to give herself up to this revolting ceremony If we are justified in regarding the *mahishī* as the consort of a king of the Kurus,—and the names Ambikā and Ambalikā actually appear in this connection in the *Mahā-Bhārata*, to wit, as the names of the mothers of Dhritarashtra and Pāṇḍu,—we might then with probability infer that there existed a hostile, jealous feeling on the part of the Kurus towards the Pañchālas, a feeling which was possibly at that time only smouldering, but which in the epic legend of the *Mahā-Bhārata* we find had burst out into the flame of open warfare. However this may be, the allusion to Kāmpīla at all events betrays that the verse, or even the whole book (as well as the correspond-

* Śāyana, on the corresponding passage of the Brāhmaṇa (v 3 3 11), remarks that Baudhāyana reads *ekā va Bhārata vājēti* (thus T S., i 8 10 a, f Br., i 7 4 2) Apastamba, on the contrary lets us choose between *Bhārata Kuraro, Janādā, Kurupāṇḍita* or *janādā* according to the people to whom the king belongs (The *Kāth* xv 7 has *ekā te janate vājā*.)

† The Prāhmaṇa of the White Yajus quotes only the beginning of this verse, consequently the words

subhadraḥ kāmṇilānām are wanting in it.

‡ As a matter of fact, we find in the *Mahā-Bhārata* a Subhadra as wife of Arjuna, the representative of the Pañchālas on account of a Subhadra (possibly on account of her abduction, related in the *Mahā-Bhārata*) a great war seems to have arisen, as appears from some words quoted several times by the scholiast on Pāṇini. Has he the authority of the *Mahābhāṣya* for this? (the *Mahābhāṣya* has nothing about it).

ing passages of the Taitt. Brāhmana), originated in the region of the Pañchālas, and this inference holds good also for the eleventh book of the Kanva recension.¹²⁹ We might further adduce in proof of it the use of the word *arjuna* in the Mādhyamdina, and of *phalguna* in the Kanva recension, in a formula¹³⁰ relating to the sacrifice at the consecration of the king (x 21) "To obtain intrepidity, to obtain food(, I, the offerer, ascend) thee(, O chariot,) I, the inviolate Arjuna (Phalgun),"*i.e.*, Indra, Indra-like. For although we must take both these words in this latter sense, and not as proper names (see *I St*, i. 190), yet, at any rate, some connection must be assumed between this use and the later one, where they appear as the appellation of the chief hero of the Pandus (or Pañchālas?), and this connection consists in the fact that the legend specially applied these names of Indra* to that hero of the Pandus (or Pañchālas?) who was pre-eminently regarded by it as an incarnation of Indra.

Lastly, as regards the critical relation of the *richas* incorporated into the Yajus, I have to observe, that in general the two recensions of the Kanvas and of the Mādhyamdinas always agree with each other in this particular, and that their differences refer, rather, to the Yajus portions. One half of the Vajasaneyi-Samhitā consists of *richas*, or verses, the other of *yajunshī*, *i.e.*, formulas in prose, a measured prose, too, which rises now and then to a true rhythmical swing. The greater number of these *richas*

¹²⁹ In T S, vii. 4. 19 1, Kāth As, iv 8, there are two vocatives instead of the two accusatives, besides, we have *subbhage* for *subbhad* rdm. The vocative *kāmpilādina* is explained by Śīyapa, "O thou that art veiled in a beautiful garment (*kāmpilābaddha* *śāghyorastra* *ruśaka* *uchyate* see *I St* xii. 312). This explanation is hardly justifiable, and Mahidhara's reference of the word to the city of Kāmpīla must be retained, at least for the wording of the text which we have in the V S. In the Pratiśāḍa Parāśabha, Kāmpīla is given as the eastern limit of Mādhyadeśa see my *Pratiśāḍa*-m, pp 101-105

¹³⁰ See V S, x. 21, the parallel passages in T S, i. 8, 15, T Br, i. 7 9 1, Kāth, xv 8, have nothing of this.

* The Brāhmana, moreover, expressly designates *arjuna* as the secret name (*guhyaṇḍma*) of Indra [u i 2. 11, v 4. 3 7]. How is this to be understood? The commentary remarks on it *arjuna* *is* *kīndrasya* *rahasyaṇḍma* *ata* *eva* *kīla* *atputre* *Pāṇḍarama* *dh* *yame* *prarūṭhā*. [What is the reading of the Kanva recension in these passages? Has it, as in the Samhitā so here also, not *arjuna*, but *phalguna*?]

recur in the Rik-Samhitā, and frequently with considerable variations, the origin and explanation of which I have already discussed in the introduction (see above, pp 9-10). Readings more ancient than those of the Rik are not found in the Yajus, or at least only once in a while, which results mainly from the fact that Rik and Yajus agree for the most part with each other, as opposed to the Saman. We do, however, find that verses have undergone later alterations to adapt them to the sense of the ritual. And finally, we meet with a large number of readings which appear of equal authority with those of the Rik, especially in the verses which recur in those portions of the Rik-Samhitā that are to be regarded as the most modern.

The Vājasaneyi-Samhitā, in both recensions, has been edited by myself (Berlin, 1849-52), with the commentary of Mahidhara,¹²¹ written towards the end of the sixteenth century, and in the course of next year a translation is intended to appear, which will give the ceremonial belonging to each verse, together with a full glossary*. Of the work of Uata, a predecessor of Mahidhara, only fragments have been preserved, and the commentary of Mādhava, which related to the Kāva recension¹²² appears to be entirely lost. Both were supplanted by Mahidhara's work, and consequently obliterated, an occurrence which has happened in a similar way in almost all branches of Indian literature, and is greatly to be regretted.

I now turn to the *Brāhmaṇa* of the White Yajus, the *Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa*, which, from its compass and contents undoubtedly occupies the most significant and important position of all the *Brahmanas*. First, as to its

¹²¹ For which, unfortunately, no sufficient manuscript materials were at my disposal, see Müller Preface to vol. vi. of his large edition of the Rik, p. xlv. sqq., and my reply in *Literarische Centralblatt*, 1875, pp. 519-520.

[This promise has not been fulfilled, owing to the pressure of other labours.] The fourteenth adhyāya the *Upaniṣad* is in the Kāva recension commented by Śaṅkara. It has been translated and edited several times together with this commen-

tary (latest again by Roer in the *Lehrbuch der Indica*, vol. viii.) [and vol. xv.—A lithographed edition of the text of the Vāja Samhitā, with a Hindi translation of Mahidhara's commentary has been published by Giriprasādvārman Māja of Deesa, 1870-74, in Deesa.]

¹²² Upon what this special statement is based I cannot at present show, but that Mādhava commented the V. Ś. also is shown, for example, by the quotation in Mahidhara to xiii. 45.

extent,—this is sufficiently denoted by its very name, which describes it as consisting of 100 *pathas* (paths), or sections. The earliest known occurrence of this name is in the ninth *vārttika* to Pan iv 2 60, and in the *gana* to Pan v 3 100, both authorities of very doubtful* antiquity. The same remark applies to the *Nageya-danata*, where the name also appears (see Benfey's *Sāmaveda*, p 277). With the single exception of a passage in the twelfth book of the *Maha-Bharata*, to which I shall revert in the sequel, I have only met with it, besides, in the commentaries and in the colophons of the MSS of the work itself. In the *Madhyamdina* school the *Satapatha-Brahmana* consists of fourteen *kāndas*, each of which bears a special title in the commentaries and in the colophons: these titles are usually borrowed from the contents, ii. and vii. are, however, to me inexplicable†. The fourteen *kāndas* are together subdivided into 100 *adhyāyas* (or 68 *prapāthakas*), 438 *brāhmanas*, and 7624 *kandikās*¹²³. In the *Kāva* recension the work consists of seventeen *kāndas*, the first, fifth, and fourteenth books being each divided into two parts, the first book, moreover, has here changed places with the second, and forms, consequently, the second and third. The names of the books are the same, but the division into *prapāthakas* is altogether unknown: the *adhyāyas* in the thirteen and a half books that have thus far been recovered* number 85, the *brahmanas* 360, the *kandikās* 4965. The total for the whole work amounts, according to a list accompanying one of the manuscripts, to 104 *adhyāyas*, 446 *brāhmanas*, 5866 *kandikās*. If from this the recension of the *Kāva* school seems considerably

* The *gana* is an *akṛti-gana*, and the *śāstra* to which it belongs is, according to the Calcutta edition, not explained in the *Mahābhāṣya*, possibly therefore it does not belong to the original text of Pāṇini. [The *vārttika* in question is, in point of fact explained in the *Mahābhāṣya* (fol 67^b) and thus the existence of the name *satapatha*, as well as *śāstra* (*śāstra*) (see p 119), is guaranteed at least for the time when this work was composed see I S¹ xiii 443.]

† The name of the second book is

Elapādika, that of the seventh *Has*

tigata.
¹²³ For statements disagreeing with this, which are found in the MSS., see notes on pp 119, 120.

‡ Of the fourth book there exists only the first half, and the third, thirteenth and sixteenth books are wanting altogether. [It is much to be regretted that nothing has yet been done for the *Kāva* recension, and that a complete copy has not yet been recovered.]

shorter than that of the *Madhyamdinas*, it is so only in appearance, the disparity is probably rather to be explained by the greater length of the *kāṇḍas* in the former. Omissions, it is true, not unfrequently occur. For the rest, I have no means of ascertaining with perfect accuracy the precise relation of the *Brahmana* of the *Kaṇva* school to that of the *Madhyamdinas*, and what I have to say in the sequel will therefore relate solely to the latter, unless I expressly mention the former.

As I have already remarked, when speaking of the *Saṁhita*, the first nine *kāṇḍas* of the *Brahmana* refer to the first eighteen books of the *Saṁhita*, they quote the separate verses in the same order* word for word, explaining them dogmatically, and establishing their connection with the ritual. The tenth *kāṇḍa*, which bears the name of *Agnī-rahasya* ("the mystery of fire"), contains mystical legends and investigations as to the significance, &c., of the various ceremonies connected with the preparation of the sacred fires, without referring to any particular portions of the *Saṁhita*. This is the case likewise in the eleventh *kāṇḍa*, called from its extent *Aṣṭādhyaṇī*, which contains a recapitulation of the entire ritual already discussed, with supplements thereto, especially legends bearing upon it, together with special particulars concerning the study of the sacred works and the provisions made for this purpose. The twelfth *kāṇḍa*, called *Madhyama*, "the middle one," treats of *prāyaścittas* or propitiatory ceremonies for untoward events, either previous to the sacrifice, during, or after it, and it is only in its last portion, where the *Saṁtrāmaṇi* is discussed, that it refers to certain of the formulas contained in the *Saṁhita* (xix.-xxi.) and relating to this ceremony. The thirteenth *kāṇḍa*, called *Aśvamedha*, treats at some length of the horse sacrifice, and then with extreme brevity of the human sacrifice, the universal sacrifice, and the sacrifice to the Manes, touching upon the relative portions of the *Saṁhita* (xxii.-xxv.) but very seldom, and even then very slightly. The fourteenth *kāṇḍa*, called *Āraṇyaka*, treats in its first three *adhyāyas*

* Only in the introduction does a variation occur, as the *Brahmana* treats first of the morning and evening sacrifices, and not till afterwards

of the new moon and full moon sacrifices, which is evidently more correct systematically

of the purification of the fire,¹²⁴ and here it quotes almost in their entirety the three last books but one of the Samhita (xxxvii-xxxix), the last six *adhyāyas* are of a purely speculative and legendary character, and form by themselves a distinct work, or Upanishad, under the name of *Vrihad-Aranyaka*. This general summary of the contents of the several *lāndas* of itself suggests the conjecture that the first nine constitute the most ancient part of the Brahmana, and that the last five, on the contrary, are of later origin,—a conjecture which closer investigation reduces to a certainty, both on external and internal evidence. With reference to the external evidence, in the first place, we find it distinctly stated in the passage of the Maha-Bharata above alluded to (xii. 11734) that the complete Śatapatha comprises a *Rahasya* (the tenth *lānda*), a *Samgraha* (the eleventh *lānda*), and a *Parīśeśha* (the twelfth, thirteenth, and fourteenth *lāndas*). Further, in the *īrttika* already quoted for the name Śatapatha, we also meet with the word *shashtipatha*¹²⁵ as the name of a work, and I have no hesitation in referring this name to the first nine *lāndas*, which collectively number sixty *adhyāyas*. On the other hand, in support of the opinion that the last five *lāndas* are a later addition to the first nine, I have to adduce the term *Madhyama* ('the middle one'), the name of the twelfth *lānda*, which can only be accounted for in this way, whether we refer it merely to the last three *kāndas* but one, or to all the five*.

¹²⁴ The *prarāgya* concerns, rather, the illustration of the sacrificer himself, see above note 124, p. 108.

¹²⁵ It is found in the *Pratijñā Pūrvashīta* also, and along with it the name *ashtipatha* (!), *śatapatha*, on the contrary is apparently wanting there, see my essay on the *Pratijñā Sūtra*, pp. 104, 105.

* In the latter case a difficulty is caused by the Kāṇva recension, which subdivides the last *kānda* into two parts (xvi, xvii), this division, however seems not to have been generally received, since in the M.S. of Sankara's commentary, at least, the Upanishad (xvi) is reckoned throughout as beginning with the

third *adhyāya* (viz., of the *lānda*), so that xvi and xvii coincide—[A highly remarkable statement is found in the MSS of the *Mādhyamādina* recension at v. 3. 1. 14, to the effect that this point marks not only *lāndāyā* 'rdhara, with 236 *lāndāḥ*, but also, according to a marginal gloss, *śatapathāyā* 'rdhara, with 3129 *lāndāḥ*, see p. 297 of my edition. As a matter of fact, the preceding *lāndāḥ* do amount to this latter number, but if we fix it as the norm for the second half, we are only brought down to xii. 7. 3. 18, that is, not even to the close of the twelfth book! The point which marks the exact half for the

Now these last five *kāndas* appear to stand in the same order in which they actually and successively originated, so that each succeeding one is to be regarded as less ancient than the one that precedes it. This conjecture is based on internal evidence drawn from the data therein contained,—evidence which at the same time decides the question of their being posterior to the first nine *kāndas*. In the first place, the tenth *kānda* still connects itself pretty closely with the preceding books, especially in its great veneration for Śandilya, the principal authority upon the building of altars for the sacred fires. The following are the data which seem to me to favour the view that it belongs to a different period from the first nine books. In १५ १, ११, all the sacrifices already discussed in the preceding books are enumerated in their proper order, and identified with the several ceremonies of the Agni-chayana, or preparation of the sacred fireplace.—Of the names of teachers here mentioned, several end in *-āyana*, a termination of which we find only one example in the seventh, eighth, and ninth *kāndas* respectively: thus we meet here with a Raubīnayana, Sayakāyana, Vamaka-kshāyana (also in vii.), Rajastambayana, Śandilyayana (also in ix.), Śatyayani (also in viii.), and the Śakayanins.—The *Vanśa* appended at the close (i.e. the list of the teachers of this book) differs from the general *Vanśa* of the entire *Brahmana* (at the close of the fourteenth book) in not referring the work to Yajñavalkya, but to Śandilya, and also to Tura Kavasheya (whose ancestor Kavasha we find on the banks of the Sarasvati in the *Āitareya-Brahmana*). The only tribes mentioned are the Salvas and Kekayas (especially their king, Aśvapati Kaikeya),—two western tribes not elsewhere alluded to in the *Brāhmanas*.—The

present extent of the work (3812 k) is at vi 7 1 19, where also the MSS repeat the above statement (p 555).—It deserves special mention that the notation of the accents operates beyond the limits of the individual *kāndas*: the accent at the end of a *kāndikā* being modified by the accent of the first word of the next *kāndikā*. From this we might perhaps conclude that the

marking of the accents is earlier in date than the division of the text into *kāndas*. As, however, we find exactly the same state of things with regard to the final and initial words of the individual *brāhmanas* (see *Jenaer Literaturzeitung*, 1875, p. 314) we should also have to refer the *brāhmana* division to a later date, and this is hardly possible.

legends here as well as in the four succeeding *kāndas* are mostly of an historical character, and are besides chiefly connected with individual teachers who cannot have lived at a time very distant from that of the legends themselves. In the earlier *kāndas*, on the contrary, the legends are mostly of a mythological character, or, if historical, refer principally to occurrences belonging to remote antiquity, so that here a distinct difference is evident.—The *trayi vidya* (the three Vedas) is repeatedly discussed in a very special manner, and the number of the *richas* is stated to be 12,000, that of the *yajus*-verses 8000, and that of the *sāmans* 4000. Here also for the first time appear the names Adhvaryus, Bahvrichas, and Chhandogis side by side,* here, too, we have the first occurrence of the words *upanishad* (as *sara* of the Ved-), *upanishadām ādeśāh*, *mīmāṃsā* (mentioned once before, it is true, in the first *kānda*), *adhidevatam*, *adhyajnam*, *adhyatmam*,¹³ and lastly, here for the first time we have the form of address *bhavad* (instead of the earlier *bhagavan*). Now and then also a *śloka* is quoted in confirmation, a thing which occurs extremely seldom in the preceding books. Further, many of the technical names of the *sāmans* and *śāstras* are mentioned (this, however, has occurred before, and also in the tenth book of the *Samhitā*), and generally, frequent reference is made to the connection subsisting with the *richas* and *sāmans*, which harmonises with the peculiarly mystical and systematising character of the whole *kānda*.

That the eleventh *kānda* is a supplement to the first nine is sufficiently evident from its contents. The first two *adhyāyas* treat of the sacrifices at the new and full moon, the four following, of the morning and evening sacrificial fires, of the sacrifices at the three seasons of the year, of the inauguration of the pupil by the teacher (*āchārya*), of the proper study of the sacred doctrines, &c., and the last two, of the sacrifices of animals. The *Rigveda*, *Yajurveda*, and *Sāmaveda*, the *Atharvāṅgirasas*, the *anushāsanas*, the *vidyās*, the *vākhādyā*, the *itihāsapurāṇa*, the *nārāsanais*, and the *gāthās* are named as subjects of study. We have

* Along with the *yāturidas* (those said to be in witchcraft), *śarpuridas* (serpent charmers), *deṇḍanaridas*,¹³ *śikṣānais*, *adhidevatam*, and *adhyatmam* occur several times in the earlier books.

already met with this enumeration (see p 93) in the second chapter of the Taitt Aranyaka, although in a considerably later form,* and we find a similar one in the fourteenth *kāṇḍa*. In all these passages, the commentaries,† probably with perfect justice, interpret these expressions in this way, viz, that first the Samhitās are specified, and then the different parts of the Brahmanas, so that by the latter set of terms we should have to understand, not distinct species of works, but only the several portions respectively so designated which were blended together in the Brāhmanas, and out of which the various branches of literature were in course of time gradually developed. The terms *anuvāsana* ("ritual precept" according to Sayana, but in Vṛhad-Ār, II 5 19, IV 3 25, Kāthopan, 6 15, "spiritual doctrine"), *vidyā*, "spiritual doctrine," and *gāthā*, "strophe of a song" (along with *śloka*), are in fact so used in a few passages (*gāthā* indeed pretty frequently) in these last five books, and in the Brahmanas or Upanishads of the Rik and Sāman. Similarly *vākovākya* in the sense of "disputation" occurs in the seventh *kāṇḍa*, and *itihāsa* at least once in the eleventh *kāṇḍa* itself (1 6 9). It is only the expressions *purāṇa* and *nāradaśāsis* that do not thus occur, in their stead—in the sense of narrative, legend—we find, rather, the terms *ākhyāna*, *vyākhyāna*, *anvākhyāna*, *upākhyāna*. *Vyākhyāna*, together with *anuvyākhyāna* and *upavyākhyāna*, also occurs in the sense of "explanation." In these expressions, accordingly, we have evidence that at the time of this eleventh *kāṇḍa* certain Samhitās and Brahmanas of the various Vedas, and even the Atharva-Samhitā itself, were in existence. But further, as bearing upon this point, in addition to the single verses from the songs of the Rik, which are here, as in the earlier books, frequently cited (by "*tad etad rishinā 'bhy-anvīktam*"), we have in the eleventh *kāṇḍa* one very special quotation, extending over an entire hymn, and introduced by the words "*tad etad vktapratyuktam pañchadaśarcham Bahurichāḥ prāhuḥ*" It is an interesting fact for the critic that in our text of the Rik the hymn in question

* From it has evidently originated a passage in Yājñavalkya's Code (I 45), which does not harmonise at all with the rest of that work

† Here Sāyana forms an exception, as he at least states the other explanation also

(*mand* x 95) numbers not fifteen but eighteen *richas*. Single *ślokas* are also frequently quoted as confirmation. From one of these it appears that the care taken of horses in the palace of Janamejaya had at that time passed into a proverb thus is also the first mention of this king Rudra here for the first time receives the name of Mahadeva* (v 3 5)—In iii 3 1, ff., special rules are for the first time given concerning the begging (*bhikṣā*) of the *brahma-chārin*s, &c., which custom is besides alluded to in the thirtieth book of the *Saṃhitā* [v 18]—But what throws special light upon the date of the eleventh *kāṇḍa* is the frequent mention here made, and for the first time, of Janaka, king (*samrāj*) of Videha, as the patron of Yajnavalkya. The latter, the Kaurupañchāla Uddālaka Āruni and his son Śvetaketu, are (as in the *Vṛihad-Āraṇyaka*) the chief figures in the legends.

The twelfth *kāṇḍa* alludes to the destruction of the kingdom of the Śrīñjayas, whom we find in the second *kāṇḍa* at the height of their prosperity, and associated with the Kurus. This connection may still be traced here, for it seems as if the Kauravya Valhika Pratīpiya wished to take their part against Chakra, their enemy, who was a native of the country south of the Revā, and priest of King Dushṭarītu of Daśapurushamarāja, but that his efforts failed—The names Varkali (i.e., Vashkali) and Naka Maudgalya probably also point to a later period of time, the latter does not occur elsewhere except in the *Vṛihad-Āraṇyaka* and the *Taittirīyopaniṣad*.—The *Rigveda*, the *Yajurveda*, and the *Sāmaveda* are mentioned, and we find testimony to the existence of the Vedic literature generally in the statement that a ceremony once taught by Indra to Vasiṣṭha and formerly only known to the Vasiṣṭhas—whence in former times only a Vasiṣṭha could act as *brahman* (high priest) at its performance—might now be studied by any one who liked, and consequently that any one might officiate as *brahman* thereat¹²⁷.—In iii. 4. 1 occurs the first mention of *puruṣa Nārāyaṇa*.—The name of Proti Kauśāmbeya Kausurabindī probably presupposes the existence of the Pañchāla city Kauśāmbī.

* In the sixth *kāṇḍa* he is still called mahā d-e-rāṣ

¹²⁷ See on this *I St.*, x. 34, 35

The thirteenth *kānda* repeatedly mentions *puruṣa Nārāyaṇa*. Here also Kuvera Vaiśravaṇa, king of the Rakṣasas, is named for the first time. So, too, we find here the first allusion to the *sūktas* of the Rik, the *anurūkas** of the Yajus, the *daśats* of the Sāman, and the *parrans* of the Atharvānas and Aṅgrasas, which division, however, does not appear in the extant text of the Atharvan. A division into *parrans* is also mentioned in connection with the Sarpavidyā and the Devajānavidyā, so that by these names at all events distinct works must be understood. Of Itihāsa and Purāṇa nothing but the name is given, they are not spoken of as divided into *parrans*, a clear proof that even at that time they were merely understood as isolated stories and legends, and not as works of any extent.¹³⁸—While in the first nine books the statement that a subject has been fully treated of already is expressed by *tasyokto bandhuh* [or, so 'sāv eva bandhuh, and the like], the same is expressed here by *tasyoktam brāhmaṇam*—The use in v 1 18 of the words *ekavachana* and *bahuvachana* exactly corresponds to their later grammatical signification—Thus *kānda* 13, however, very specially distinguished by the number of *gāthās*, strophes of historical purport, which it quotes at the close of the account of the horse sacrifice, and in which are given the names of kings who celebrated it in earlier times. Only one of these *gāthās* appears in the Rik Samhitā (*mand* iv 42 8), the greater number of them recur in the last book of the Aitareya-Brahmana, and in the Mahā-Bharata, xii, 910, ff., in both places with many variations†. The question here arises whether we have to regard these *gāthās* as fragments of more lengthy hymns, or if they must be looked upon merely as separate memorial verses. The fact that in connection with some of these names (if we take into account

* This term, however, occurs in the preceding *kāndas* also, e.g., in ix 1 1 15.

¹³⁸ Thus is favoured also by the fact that they are here attributed to fishermen and fowlers, with which may be compared the tale of the Fisher-king as mother of Vyāsa in the Mahā-Bharata. The whole statement recurs in almost identical

terms in the Śākh. Śr., xvi 2, *Ātval Śr* 1 7.

† The passages in the Mahā-Bharata evidently connect themselves with the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa, to which, as well as to its author Yājñavalkya, and his patron Janaka, special regard is had in this book of the Mahā-Bharata. [See also Śākh., xvi 8 25-29 32.]

the *Antareya-Brahmana* also) two, three, four, five, and even six verses are quoted, and always in the same metre, in *ślokas*, certainly favours the former view. Only one exception occurs where the first and fourth verses are *ślokas*, but the second *trishtubh*, the third not being quoted at all, it is, however, according to the commentary, understood by implication, so that this instance tells, perhaps, with a very special force in favour of the view in question. The analogy of the *gāthās* or *ślokas* of non-historic purport quoted elsewhere cannot be brought forward in support either of the one view or of the other, for the very same uncertainty exists respecting them. Moreover, these verses repeatedly contain very old Vedic forms*. Again, their expressions of eulogy are for the most part very hyperbolic, and they might therefore perhaps be looked upon as the utterance of a still fresh feeling of gratitude, so that we should have to consider their origin as in part contemporary with the princes they extol otherwise this circumstance does not readily admit of explanation.† A passage in the thirteenth *kāṇḍa* itself directly favours this view (see *I St*, 1. 187). Among the kings here named the following deserve special mention. Bharata, son of Dushshanta and the Apsaras Sakuntala, and descendant of Sudhumna—Satanika‡ Satrajita, king of the Bharatas, and enemy of Dhritarashtra, king of the Kasis—Purukutsa§ Aikshvaka—Para Atinara Hairanyanabha Kausalya—but above all, Janamejaya Parikshita, with the Parikshitīyas (his three brothers) Bhīmasena, Ugrasena, and Śrutasena, who by means of the horse sacrifice were absolved from “all guilt, all *brahma-hatyā*.” The time when these last four lived cannot be considered as very distant from that of the *kāṇḍa* itself, since their sacrificial priest Indrota Darvapa Śaunaka (whom the *Mahā-Bharata*, xii. 5595, also specifies as such) is once mentioned in it apparently as coming forward in opposi-

* And names too thus, the king of the Pañchālas is called Kravya, the explanation given by the Brāhmaṇa being that the Pañchālas were “formerly” called Krivis.

† Unless these verses were merely invented by priests in order to stimulate kings to copy and emulate the liberality of their ancestors.

Still this is both in itself a very forced explanation and besides many of these verses are of purely historical purport, and contain no allusion to the presents given to the priests.

‡ See *Vāj S*, 34. 52 (not in the *Rik*).

§ See *Rik*, *mand* iv. 42. 8.

tion to Bhallaveya, while his own opinion, differing from that of the latter, is in turn rejected by Yajnavalkya. On account of the interest of the subject I introduce here another passage from the fourteenth book, from which we may gather the same result. We there find a rival of Yajnavalkya testing him with a question, the solution of which the former had previously obtained from a Gandharva, who held in his possession the daughter of Kapya Patamechala of the country of the Madras,—the question, namely, "Whither have the Parikshitas gone?" the solution of which therefore appears to have been looked upon as extremely difficult. Yajnavalkya answers "Thither where (all) *asamedha* sacrificers go." Consequently the Parikshitas must at that time have been altogether extinct. Yet their life and end must have been still fresh in the memory of the people, and a subject of general curiosity.* It almost seems as though their "guilt, their *brahmahatyā*," had been too great for people to believe that it could have been atoned for by sacrifices were they ever so holy, or that by such means the Parikshitas could have become partakers of the reward fixed for other less culpable evil-doers. It appears further as if the Brahmans had taken special pains to rehabilitate their memory, and in this undoubtedly they were completely successful. Or was it, on the contrary, that the majesty and power of the Parikshitas was so great and dazzling, and their end so surprising, that it was difficult to believe they had really passed away? I prefer, however, the former explanation.

The fourteenth *kāṇḍa*, at the beginning of its first part (that relating to ritual), contains a legend of a contention among the gods, in which Vishnu came off victorious, whence it became customary to say, "Vishnu is the *śreṣṭha* (luckiest?) of the gods." This is the first time that we find Vishnu brought into such prominence, indeed, he otherwise only appears in the legend of the three strides, and as the representative of the sacrifice itself—a position which is, in fact, ascribed to

* The country of the Madras lies in the north west, and is therefore remote from the country of the Kurus. According to the Mahābhārata, however, Mitrī, second

wife of Pāṇḍu and mother of the two youngest Pāṇḍavas, Nakula and Sahadeva, was a native of this region, and Parikshit also had a Mādras wife.

him here also. Indra, as here related, afterwards strikes off his head in jealousy¹²⁰. The second part of this *lānda*, the *Vrihad-Āranyaka*, which consists of five *prapāthakas*, or six *adhyāyas*, is again divided into three *kāndas*, the *Madhulānda*, *adhy 1 u* (*prap 1 i-u 5*), the *Yājñavalkya-lānda*, *adhy iii iv* (*prap ii 6-iv 3*), and the *Khilā-lānda*, *adhy v vi* (*prap iv 4-v 5*). Of these three divisions, each succeeding one appears to be later than that which precedes it, and each closes with a *Vanśa* or statement of the line of teachers, carried back to Brahman, the primeval source. The third *brāhmaṇa* of the *Madhu-lānda* is an explanation of three *ślokas* prefixed to it, a form of which we have no previous example. The fifth (*adhy ii 1*) contains, as has already been stated (p 51), another recension of the legend related in the fourth *adhyāya* of the *Kaushītaky-Upamśhad*, of Ajatasatru, the king of Kāśī, who was jealous of Janaka's fame as a patron of learning. The eighth (*adhy ii 4*) contains another recension of the closing legend in the *Yājñavalkya-kānda*, of Yājñavalkya's two wives, Maitreyī and Katyāyānī,—thus being the first mention we have of these names. Here, as also in the eleventh *lānda*, we find an enumeration of the subjects of Vedic study, namely, *Rigveda*, *Yajurveda*, *Sāmaveda*, the *Ātharvāṅgirasas*, *itihāsa*, *purāṇa*, *vidyās*, *upaniśads*, *ślokas*, *sūtras*, *anvyaśhyānas*, *vyākhyānas**. The same enumeration recurs in the *Yājñavalkya-lānda* (*adhy vi 10*). Śamkara and Dīvedagāṅga, the commentators of the *Vrihad-Āranyaka*, both, like Sayana (on the eleventh *lānda*), take the expressions *itihāsa*, &c., to mean sections in the *Brāhmaṇas*. They are, in fact, as I have already pointed out (p 122), used in

¹²⁰ This is wrong. The gods send forth ants to gnaw the bowstring of Vishnu, who stands leaning on his banded bow, the string, snapping and springing upwards, severs his head from his body. The same legend recurs not only in the parallel passage of the *Taitt. Ār* (v 1), but also in the *Pañch Br* vii 5 6, but whilst in the *Sat. Br* it is related of Vishnu the *Taitt. Ār* tells it of Mitha Vashisṭha, and

the *Pañch Br* of Mitha alone (cf also *T. S.*, iii 2 4 1). In the *Satapatha*, Mitha is only mentioned among the gods who assembled though to be sure he appears immediately before *Valga*.

* The last five expressions take here the place of *anvyaśhyānas*, *vidyās*, *ślokas*, &c., and *śūtras* in the eleventh book. The latter are clearly the more ancient.

thus sense in the Brahmanas themselves. It is only in regard to *sūtra** that I am unable to prove a similar use (though Dvivedagaṅga pretty frequently calls certain sentences by the name of *sūtra*, e.g., 1 2 18, 22, 3 1, &c.), and this term raises a doubt whether the opinion of the commentators ought to hold good with reference to these passages also, and their time. The ninth (which is the last) *brāhmaṇa* is evidently the one from which the Madhu-kāṇḍa received its name. It treats of the intimate relation existing between the four elements (earth, water, fire, air), the sun, the quarters of the heavens, the moon, lightning, thunder, *ālāśa* (ether), &c., on the one hand, and all beings on the other, this relation being set forth by representing the one as the *madhu* (honey) of the other. This doctrine is traced to Dadhyañch Ātharvana, as is also, in fact, done in the Rik-Samhitā itself (1. 116 12, 117 22). In the beginning of the fourth *kāṇḍa* of the Satap Brahmana also (iv 1 5 18) we find the *madhu nāma brāhmaṇam* mentioned expressly in this connection, Sayana, too, quotes *Śātyāyana* (-*Vājasaneyau*) in support of it. A very early date is thus guaranteed for the name at least, and probably also for the contents of this chapter, though its form, of course, cannot make any pretension to high antiquity. The concluding Vāṇśi here as elsewhere, varies very much in the two schools, that is, as regards the last twenty members or so back to Yaska and Āsurayana, but from these upwards to the mythical fountain-heads the two schools generally agree. Āsurayana himself (consequently, also Yaska, who is recorded as his contemporary) is here placed two stages after Āsuri, at the end of the Khila-kāṇḍa he is even designated as his pupil, Āsuri, again, being set down as the pupil of Yajnavalkya. The list closes, therefore, with about the twenty-fifth member from the latter. It must consequently have been continued long after the Madhu-kāṇḍa had been finally put into shape, since both the analogy of the Vāṇśa contained in the last *brāhmaṇa* but one of the Khila-kāṇḍa and the very nature of the case forbid the

* The word *sūtra* is found several times here, but in the sense of a supreme Brahman itself, which, like a thread, binds together and holds together all things, and thus holds together the whole universe.

conclusion that its redaction could have taken place so late as the twenty-fifth generation from Yajnavalkya. The commentators never enter into any explanation of these *Vaṅśas*, doubtless, therefore, they too regarded them as supplements. The names themselves are naturally highly interesting, and, as far at least as the later stages are concerned, are probably strictly authentic.—The aim of the *Yajnavalkya-kāṇḍa* is the glorification of Yajnavalkya, and it recounts how, at the court of his patron Janaka, king of Videha, he silenced all the Brahmans* of the Kurupañchalas, &c., and gained his patron's full confidence (like the corresponding legends in the twelfth book of the *Maha-Bharata*). The legend narrated in the eleventh *kāṇḍa* (vi. 3 1 ff.) may perhaps have been the model, at least the *Yajnavalkya* here begins in exactly the same manner, and gives also, almost in the same words, the account of the discomfiture and punishment of Vidagdha Śākalya, which alone is given in the eleventh *kāṇḍa*. It closes with a legend already given in the *Madhu-kāṇḍa*, but with some deviations. The expressions *pāṇḍitya*, *muni*, and *mauna*, occurring in this *kāṇḍa*, are worthy of special notice as being new¹⁴⁰ (iii. 2 1, iv 2 25), further, *chahansa*, *śramara tāpasa* (iv 1 12, 22), *pratravin* (iv 2 25, where *bhṛśnācharya* is recommended), and *pratibuddha* (iv 2 17, the verb *pratibudh* occurs in this sense i. 2 21), and lastly, the names *chāṇḍāla* and *paukasa* (iv 1 22). I am now of opinion† that it is to this *Yajnavalkya-kāṇḍa* that the *vārttika* to Pāṇini iv 3 105 refers when it speaks of the *Yajnavalkya brāhmaṇa* as not *purāṇa-prōṭa*, but *tulyakāla*, "contemporaneous," i.e., with Pāṇini. The wording of the *vārttika* does not necessarily imply that

* Among them Aśvala, the king's Hotar Vidagdha Śākalya, who lost his life for his impertinence, Kabala Kauṭakeya, and Gārgi Vācha-knavi, who all four (the latter at least, according to the *Gṛhya-Sūtra*) may be looked upon as representatives of the Rik towards which therefore a kind of jealousy is here unmistakably exhibited.

¹⁴⁰ The word *muni* occurs in the later portions of the Y & Somp

hitā, vii, viii. 17 14, and x 136 2-5.—First German edition Errata. *Paulikasa* is found also in V S. 30. 17.

† Formerly I was of different opinion, see I St, i. 57. Many of the views there expressed—especially pp 161-232—have here either been further developed or modified after careful consideration of the various passages, as may be perceived by comparison.

these Brāhmanas originated from Yājñavalkya himself, consequently they might bear his name simply because treating of him. I prefer the latter view, for it appears to me very hazardous to regard the entire Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa, or even its last books only, as directly bearing the name of Yājñavalkya,—however fully it may embody his system,—or to set it down as contemporaneous with, or but little anterior to, Pāṇini. In regard to the Yājñavalkya-kāṇḍa, however, I have not the slightest hesitation in doing the latter¹⁴¹.—Finally, the *Khila-kāṇḍa*, or last *kāṇḍa* of the Vṛihad-Āraṇyaka, is uniformly described by the commentators as such a *khila*, or supplement, and as a matter of fact it is clearly enough distinguished from the other *kāṇḍas*. Its first *adhyāya*—the fifth of the Vṛihad-Āraṇyaka—is made up of a number of small fragments, which contain for the most part mystical plays upon words, of the most clumsy description. The second *adhyāya* contains two *brāhmanas*, parts of which, as I have already remarked (p. 71), recur in precisely the same form in the Chhandogyopaniṣad vii. 1, 3. Of the third *brāhmaṇa*, which contains ritual injunctions, we also find another recension, *ibid* vii. 2. It concludes with a *Vanśa*, not, however, in the form of a list, but of a detailed account. According to it, the first author of the doctrine here taught was Uddalaka Āruṇi, who imparted it to Yājñavalkya, here for the first time called Vājasaneyā, * his pupil was Madhuka Paṇḍya, from whom the doctrine was transmitted to Chūda Bhagavitti, then to Jānakī Ayahsthūna, and lastly to Satyakāma Jabāla. The name of the latter (a teacher often alluded to in the Chhandogyopaniṣad) is in fact borne in later works by a school of the White Yajus, so

¹⁴¹ On this subject compare Goldstücker's detailed discussion in his *Pāṇini* p. 132-140 and my special rejoinder, *I Str.* v. 65-74, xii. 443, 444, *I Str.* ii. 214. According to these expositions, the author of the *varttikas* must, on the one hand, have considered the Yājñavalkya Brāhmaṇas as originally promulgated (*prōlatā*) by Yājñavalkya, but on the other hand, he must also have looked upon the recension then extant as contemporaneous with Pā

ṇini. Although he here counts Yājñavalkya among the *puruṣas*, 'ancients,'—and this interpretation is required by the wording of the *varttika*,—yet the Kāśikā, on the contrary, expressly declares him to be "not *chitra-kāṇḍa*."

* In the Yājñavalkyākāṇḍa Uddalaka Āruṇi is, like the other Brāhmaṇas, silenced by Yājñavalkya: no mention being made of his being the preceptor of the latter.

that we might perhaps ascribe to him the final adjustment of this doctrine in its existing form. The fourth and last *brāhmaṇa* of this *adhyāya* is, like the third, surprising, from the nature of its contents, which, consisting as they do of the rites to be observed before, and at the time of, coitus, as well as after the birth of a son, more properly pertain to a *Grihya-Sūtra*. It too closes with a *Vanśa*,* this time of quite unusual length, and distinguished, as far as the more recent members are concerned, by this peculiarity, that their names are formed by the addition of *putra* to the mother's name (see above p. 71), and that both parts of the names are accentuated. Āsuri is here called the pupil of Yajnavalkya, and the latter the pupil of Uddalaka. Then, having passed through ten more stages and arrived at Āditya, the sun-god, as the original author, we find the following words as the close of the whole *Brahmana* *ādityāni māni śūklāni yajunshī Vājasaneyena Yajnavalkyend 'khyāyante*, 'these White Yajus-texts originating† from Āditya are transmitted by Vajasaneja Yajnavalkya.' According to Śamkara and Dvivedagaṅga, this *Vanśa* does not refer to the *Khila-kāṇḍa*, but to the entire *Pravachana*, the entire *Veda* (i.e., the White Yajus). This view is at all events favoured by the fact that the *Vanśa* at the close of the tenth book (the only one which appears in the whole of the *Śatapatha-Brahmana*, besides those of the *Madhu-kāṇḍa*, *Yajnavalkya-kāṇḍa*, and *Khila-kāṇḍa*)‡ evidently refers to this *Vanśa*, and presupposes its existence when at its commencement it says *samāram a Samjivīputrāt*, 'up to Samjivīputra the teachers are the same'. For, ascending from this Samjivīputra, there are still in this *Vanśa* three steps up to Yajnavalkya, while in the tenth book, as before remarked, the doctrine is not traced up to the latter at all, but from Samjivīputra through five steps to Śandilya, and through two more to Tura Kavasheya.§—This latter circumstance suggests to

* In the Kāṇva recension the *Vanśas* invariably form separate chapters.

† Or 'these White Yajus texts are named by Vājasaneja Yajnavalkya as originating from Āditya' (1).

‡ The Kāṇva recension adds this

Vanśa here too at the close after the words *Yajnavalkyend 'khyāyante*.

§ Who is quoted in the *Ātār Brāhmaṇa* as contemporaneous with Janamejaya (as his sacrificial priest), see *J. St.*, I. 203, note.

us, moreover, the possibility of yet another division of the Śatapatha-Brahmana with reference to the origin of the different *kāṇḍas*. For in the first five and the last four *kāṇḍas* the name of Yājñavalkya meets us exclusively, and very frequently, as that of the teacher whose opinion is appealed to as the decisive authority, whose system consequently is in any case there set forth*. Further, if we except the Yajñavalkya-*kāṇḍa* and the *gāthās* in the thirteenth *kāṇḍa*, races settled in eastern or central Hindustān are the only ones mentioned in these *kāṇḍas*, viz., the Kurupañchālas, Kosālavidehas, Śviknas, and Śrñjayas. Once only the Prachyas (eastern tribes) are opposed to the Vahīkas (western tribes), again there is once mention made of the Udīchyas (inhabitants of the north), and lastly, the (southern) Nishadhas are once alluded to in the name of their king Nala Naishadha (or, as he is here called, Naishudha). From this the remaining *kāṇḍas*—the sixth to the tenth—differ palpably enough. They recognise Śandilya as the final authority† instead of Yajñavalkya, whom they do not even name, neither do they mention any but north-western races, viz., the Gandhāras with their king Nagnajit, the Salvas, and the Kekayas‡. May not the above-mentioned Vansī apply not only to the tenth book, but to these five *kāṇḍas*? Since the latter treat specially of the fire-ritual, of the erection of the sacred fire-altars, their possible north-

* The fact that this is so clear may easily account for the circumstance that the Purāṇas have here for once a statement in conformity with fact, as they cite Yājñavalkya as the author of the White Yajus. We may here mention that the name of Yājñavalkya occurs nowhere else in Vedic literature, which might be explained partly by the difference of locality, partly by his having edited the White Yajus after the text of the other Vedas had been fixed, though the latter reason seems insufficient, since other teachers of the White Yajus are mentioned frequently in later Vedic literature, as, for instance Aruni, Svetaketu, Satyaśāma, Jābala, &c., who are either his contemporaries, or belong to even

later times. Besides his patron Janaka is mentioned at least in the Kausītaki - Upanishad [in the sections of the Kausītaki, or, Śākhāyana Āraṇyaka, which, however, are clearly of very late origin Yājñavalkya himself is actually cited (9 7 and 13 1), but these passages are themselves direct quotations from Śatap. Br. 11 1 — In the Gopatha Br., which shows so many special points of relationship to the Śatapatha, Yājñavalkya is never mentioned].

† So do the Śāma Sūtras, Śāṇḍilya is mentioned besides in the Chhāndogya only.

‡ The legend concerning these races in the Chhāndogya.

western origin might be explained by the fact that the doctrine upon this subject had, though differing from that of the Persa-Aryans, been kept particularly pure in the north-west owing to the proximity of this latter people.* However this may be, whether the north-western origin of the doctrine of these five *kāṇḍas* be well founded or otherwise,¹⁴² they at any rate belong, in their present form, to the same period as (the tenth possibly to a somewhat later period than) the first five *kāṇḍas*. On this point the mention of Aruna Aupaveśi, Aruni, Śvetaketu Aruneya, and of Indradyumna (in the tenth book), as well as the frequent reprehension of the Charakadhvaryus, is decisive. That the various parts of the Brahmana were blended together by one arranging hand¹⁴³ is evident in particular from the repeated occurrence of phrases intimating that a subject has already been treated of in an earlier part, or is to be found presented more in detail in a later part. A closer investigation of the various instances where this occurs has not as yet been within my power.

The number of deviations in regard to ritual or readings cited in the Brahmana is very great. To these regard is had here and there even in the Samhita itself, two different *mantras* being quoted side by side as equally good. Most frequently the citation of such variations in the Brahmana is introduced by the words *ity eke*, or *tad āhuḥ*, yet pretty often the names of individual teachers are also mentioned, who must here, in part at least, be looked upon as representing the schools which bear their names. Thus in addition to those already named we have Ashadha Savayasa, Barku Varshna, Aupoditeya, Pañchi, Takshan, Jīvala Chailaki, Āsuri, Madhuki, Kaboda Kaushitaki, Varshna, a Satyayajna, Satyayajni, Tandya, Budila Āsvataraśvi,

* Ought we to bring the Śākhyaṇas into direct connection with the latter? But then what would become of the connection between Sakāyanya (in the Mantrāyari Upanishad) and the Śākyas? (!)

¹⁴² See on this my detailed discussion in *I St.*, xiii 265-269, where I call special attention to various differences in point of language between books 1-7 and vi-ix.

¹⁴³ The strong connexure pointed up on the residents on the seven western rivers in ix. 3. 1-24 must be ascribed to this 'arranging hand'. See *I St.*, xiii 267—That the White Yajus was arranged in eastern Hindu land seems to be proved by the statements in the Pratiśākhī Parīśista respecting the extent of the Madhyadeśa—see my essay on the Pratiśākhī Sūtra, pp 101, 105.

Rāma Aupatasvini, Kaukūsta, Mahitthi, Mudimbha* Audanya, Saunāpau Mānutantavyau, Satyakama Jabāla, Śailali, &c Besides the Charakādhvaryus, Bhallaveya in particular is regularly censured, from which I conclude, as already stated (p 95), that the Bhallavi-Brāhmaṇa should be reckoned among those of the Black Yajus. By the "eke," where these are found fault with, we should probably also understand (e.g., once for certain in the first *kāṇḍa*) the adherents of the Black Yajus. Once, however (in the eighth *kāṇḍa*), a reading of the Kanva school is quoted by "eke" and disputed. How the matter stands in the Brāhmaṇa of the latter as to this passage, whether it finds fault with the reading of the Mādhyandina school, I am not able to say. A collection of passages of this kind would naturally be of peculiar interest.

The legends interspersed in such numbers throughout the Brāhmaṇa have a special significance. In some of them the language is extremely antiquated, and it is probable therefore that before their incorporation into it they possessed an independent form. The following deserve special mention from their being treated in detail, viz., the legends of the Deluge and the rescue of Manu, of the emigration of Videgha Mathava from the Sarasvatī to the Sadanīra in the country of the Kosala-Videhas, of the restoration to youth of Chyavana by the Aśvins at the request of his wife Sukanya, the daughter of Saryāta Manava, of the contest between Kadrū and Suparnī, of the love and separation of Purūravas and Urvaśī, and others. Many of them reappear as episodes in the epic, in a metrical garb, and often very much altered. It is obvious that we have here a much more intimate connection with the epic than exists in the other Brāhmaṇas. The names Valhika, Janamejaya, and Nagnajit have the most direct reference to the legend of the Mahā-Bharata, as also the names already discussed above in connection with the Samhita, Amba, Ambika, Ambalikā, Subhadra, and the use there made of the words *arjuna* and *phalguna*. In any case, we must look for the explanation

* Compare the Muṣibhas in the Aitar B. —Of the above, only Buḍhi, the Saunāpau Satyakāma, Mādhuḥi (or Paṇḍya), and Kauṣītaki are mentioned elsewhere.

of this in the circumstance, that this Brahmana substantially originated and attained its final shape among the tribes of the Kurupañchālas and the neighbouring Kosala-Videhas. The king of the latter, Janaka, who is represented in it as the chief patron of the sacred doctrine it embodies, bears the same name as the father of Sita and father-in-law of Rama, in the Rāmāyana. This is, however, the only point of contact with the Rāmāyana legend which can here be traced, and as the name Janaka seems to have belonged to the whole family, it also virtually disappears. Nevertheless I am inclined to identify the father of Sita with this exceptionally holy Janaka, being of opinion that Sita herself is a mere abstraction, and that consequently she had assigned to her the most renowned father possible. As regards the special relation in which the Brahmana stands to the legend of the Maha-Bharata, Lassen, it is well known, takes as the fundamental feature of the latter a conflict between the Kurus and the Pañchālas, ending in their mutual annihilation, the latter being led by the family of the Pandus, who came from the west. Now at the time of the Brahmana, we find the Kurus and the Pañchālas still in full prosperity,* and also united in the closest bonds of friendship as one people†. Consequently this internecine strife cannot yet have taken place. On the other hand, in the latest portions of the Brāhmana, we find the prosperity, the sin, the expiation, and the fall of Janamejaya Parikshita and his brothers Bṛīhasena, Ugrasena, and Śrutisena, and of the whole family of the Parikshitās, apparently still fresh in the memory of the people and discussed as a subject of controversy. In the Maha-Bharata boundless confusion prevails regarding these names. Janamejaya and his brothers, already mentioned, are represented either as great-grandsons of Kuru, or else as the great grandsons of the Panduid Arjuna, at whose snake-sacrifice Vaiśampayana related the history of th

* Though certainly in the last portions of the Br the Kosala-Videhas seem to have a certain preponderance and there had perhaps existed as early as the time of the Samhitā (see p. 114) a certain rivalry between the Kurus and Pañchālas.

† At least I am not able to offer another explanation of the word Kurupañchāla it is, moreover, noteworthy that no name of a king of the Kurupañchālas is ever mentioned. Such names are quoted only for Kauravya- or Pāñchāla kings.

great struggle between the Kurus and the Pándus. Adopting the latter view, which appears to be the better warranted, from the fact that the part of the *Mahá-Bhárata* which contains it is written in prose, and exhibits a peculiarly ancient garb, the supposed great internecine conflict between the Kurus and the Pañchálas, and the dominion of the Pándavas, must have been long past at the time of the *Brahmana*. How is this contradiction to be explained? That something great and marvellous had happened in the family of the Parikshitas, and that their end still excited astonishment at the time of the *Bráhmāna*, has already been stated. But what it was we know not. After what has been said above, it can hardly have been the overthrow of the Kurus by the Pañchálas, but at any rate, it must have been deeds of guilt, and indeed I am inclined to regard this as yet unknown 'something' as the basis of the legend of the *Mahá-Bhárata*.¹⁴³ To me it appears absolutely necessary to assume, with Lassen, that the Pándavas did not originally belong to the legend, but were only associated with it at a later time,¹⁴⁴ for not only is there no trace of them anywhere in the *Bráhmanas* or *Sútras*, but the name of their chief hero, Arjuna (*Phalguna*), is still employed here, in the *Śatapatha-Bráhmāna* (and in the *Samhitá*), as a name of Indra, indeed he is probably to be looked upon as originally identical with Indra, and therefore destitute of any real existence. Lassen further (*I AK*, i. 647, ff.) concludes, from what Megasthenes (in Arrian) reports of the Indian Heracles, his sons and his daughter *Harðala*, and also from other accounts in Curtius, Pliny, and Ptolemy,* that at the time when Megasthenes wrote, the mythical association of Krishna (?) with the Pándavas already ex-

¹⁴³ See *Indian Antiquary*, ii. 53 (1873). I may add the following, as it possibly has a bearing here. *Vishadvaṃśa Abhipratárana* (see *Ant Br.*, iii. 48) was cursed by a Brahman on account of improper sacrifice to the effect that 'mari eṣa prāṣṭa śamānā Kuravaḥ Kurukṣetrāḥ divo-ślyanta i. e. śálikh, xv. 6. 12 (and so it came to pass). For the glorification of the Kaurava king Parikshit the four verses, *Śálikh Sr.*, xii. 17

i-4 (*Áth*, xx. 127. 7-10), &c., although in *Ant Br.*, vi. 22 (*Śálikh Br.* xxx. 5), they are referred to 'fire' or 'year,' but see *Gop. h. Br.*, xi. 12. Another legend respecting Janamejaya's Párlubha is found in the *Gopatha-Br.*, ii. 5.

¹⁴⁴ See my detailed discussion of this in *I St.*, ii. 402-404.

* Curtius and Pliny wrote in the first, Arrian and Ptolemy in the second century A. D.

isted. But this conclusion, although perhaps in itself probable, is at least not certain,* and even if it were, it would not prove that the Pándavas were at that time already associated with the legend of the Kurus. And if we have really to assign the arrangement of the *Madhyamdira* recension (see p. 106) to about the time of Megasthenes, it may reasonably be inferred, from the lack of all mention of the Pándavas in it, that their association with the Kurus had not then been established, although, strictly speaking, this conclusion has weight not so much for the period when the arrangement of the work actually took place, as for the time to which the pieces arranged belong.

As with the epic legends, so also do we find in the *Satapatha-Brahmana* several points of contact with the legends of the Buddhists, on the one hand, and with the later tradition concerning the origin of the *Samkhya* doctrine, on the other. First, as regards the latter. *Āsuri*, the name of one of its chief authorities, is at the same time the name of a teacher frequently mentioned in the *Satapatha-Brahmana*. Again, though only in the *Yajñavalkya-kāṇḍa*, we have mention of a *Kapya Patamchala* of the country of the Madras as particularly distinguished by his exertions in the cause of Brahmanical theology, and in his name we cannot but see a reference to *Kapila* and *Paṭanjali*, the traditional founders of the *Samkhya* and *Yoga* systems. As regards the Buddhist legends, the *Śākyas* of *Kapilavastu* (whose name may possibly be connected with the *Śakayanins* of the tenth *lāṇḍa*, and the *Śakayanva* of the *Maitrayana-Upaniṣad*) called themselves *Gautamas*, a family name which is particularly often represented among the teachers and in the lists of teachers of the *Brahmana*. It is moreover, the country of the *Kosalas* and *Videhas* that is to be looked upon as the cradle of Buddhism.—*Śveta-ketu* (son of *Aruni*), one of the teachers most frequently mentioned in the *Satapatha-Brahmana*, is with the Buddhists the name of one of the earlier births of *Śākyamuni*.

* The inc. s* of Hercules with *Harṣana* must certainly be traced to the tales of *Prājñā* and his daughter so often touched on in the *Brahmanas*. (See *Āditya*

and *Arjuna* occur together in *Pān.* iv 3 98, cannot be considered as a proof of their being connected with each other, see *I 82*, xiii 2-3, ff.]

(see *Ind. Stud.*, n. 76, note) — That the *māgadha* of the Samhitā may perhaps also be adduced in this connection is a point that has already been discussed (pp 111, 112) — The words *arhant* (III. 4. 1. 3, ff.), *śramana* (Vrih. Ār., IV. 1. 22, as well as Taitt. Ār., II. 7, beside *tāpasa*), *mahābrāhmaṇā** (Vrih. Ār., II. 1. 19. 22), and *pratibuddha*, although by no means used in their Buddhistic technical sense, yet indicate how this gradually arose. — The name Chelaka also in the Brāhmaṇa may possibly have some connection with the peculiarly Buddhistic sense attached to the word *chela*. Ajātaśatru and Brahmadatta,† on the contrary, are probably but namesakes of the two persons designated by the Buddhists under these names as contemporaries of Buddha (?) The same probably also applies to the Vatsīputriyas of the Buddhists and the Vātsīputras of the Vrih. Ārany (v. 5. 31), although this form of name, being uncommon, perhaps implies a somewhat closer connection. It is, however, the family of the Kātyāyanas, Kātyāyanīputras, which we find represented with special frequency among the Buddhists as well as in the Brāhmaṇa (although only in its very latest portions). We find the first mention‡ of this name in the person of one of the wives of Yajñavalkya, who is called Kātyāyanī, both in the Madhu-kāṇḍa and the Yajñavalkya-kāṇḍa, it also appears frequently in the lists of teachers, and almost the whole of the Sūtras belong-

* Beside *mahārāja*, which is found even earlier, I. 5. 3. 21. II. 5. 4. 9.

† With the surname Chaikitāneya Vrih. Ār. Mādhy., I. 1. 26 — In Mahā Bhārata, XII. 5135, 5603, a *Pañchādhyāyī* named Brahmadatta is mentioned, who reigned in Kāmpilya. — Chaikitāneya is to be distinguished from Chaikitāyana in the Chhāndogyaop., in 8. — [On a curious coincidence of a legend in the Vrih. Ār. with a Buddhist legend, see *J. St.*, III. 156, 157.]

‡ In the tenth book of the Taitt. Ār., Kātyāyana (in. deal of enl) is a name of Durgā, on this see *J. St.*, II. 192 [XIII. 422]. — In the *Ganapāṭha* to Pāṇini, Kātyāyana is wanting. [But Kātyāyanī is to be gathered from Pāṇini himself, IV. 1. 18.

see *J. St.*, v. 61, 63, 64. A Kātyāyanīputra Jātukarmya is quoted in the Śāṅkh. Ār., VIII. 10. Patanjali in the Mahābhāṣya mentions several Kātyas (*J. St.*, XII. 399, 407), and indeed the *vaśīkāḍra* directly belongs to this family. In no other Vedic texts have I found either the Kātyas or the Kātyas, Kātyāyanas, excepting in the *pramāṇa* section appended at the end of the *Āśvalāyana-Srauta-Sūtra*, XII. 13-15, in which the Kātyas and the patronymic, Kātyas, are mentioned several times. The Kuru-Kātyas are cited in the *gana* 'Garga,' and the family of the Kātyas seems therefore to have been specially connected with the Kurus; see *J. St.*, I. 227, 228.]

ing to the White Yajus bear this name as that of their author

The Śatapatha-Brahmana has been commented in the Mādhyamdina recension by Harisvamin and Sáyana, but their commentaries are so far extant only in a fragmentary form.¹¹⁵ The Vrihad-Āranyaka has been explained by Dviveda Gaṅga (of Gujarat), and in the Kanva recension by Samkara, to whose commentary a number of other works by his pupils, &c, attach themselves. As yet only the first *kānda*, with extracts from the commentaries, has been published, edited by myself. In the course of the next three years, however, the work will be printed in its entirety.¹¹⁷ The Vrihad-Āranyaka in the Kanva recension has been edited by Poley, and recently by Roer, together with Samkara's commentary and a gloss thereon.¹¹⁸

I now turn to the *Sūtras* of the White Yajus. The first of these, the *Śrauta-Sūtra* of *Katyāyana*, consists of twenty-six *adhyāyas*, which on the whole strictly observe the order of the Brahmana. The first eighteen correspond to its first nine *kāndas*, the Sautrāmanī is treated of in the nineteenth, the horse sacrifice in the twentieth *adhyāya*, the twenty-first contains the human, universal, and Manes sacrifices. The next three *adhyāyas* refer, as before stated (p 80), to the ceremonial of the Samaveda, to its several *ekāhas*, *ahīnas*, and *sattras*, yet they rather specify these in the form of lists than present, as the other *adhyāyas* do, a clear picture of the whole sacrificial proceedings. The twenty-fifth *adhyāya* treats of the *prāyaścittas*, or expiatory ceremonies, corresponding to the first part of the twelfth *kānda*, and lastly, the twenty-sixth *adhyāya* contains the *pravargya* sacrifice, corresponding to the first part of the fourteenth *kānda*.—Only a few teachers are cited by name, and among these are two belonging to authors of *Sūtras* of the Black Yajus, viz, Laugakṣhi and Bharadvaja, besides whom, only Jātūkarnya, Vātsya, Bādarī, Kaśa-

¹¹⁵ And in very bad manuscripts

¹¹⁶ The last fasciculus was published in 1855. A translation of the first book, and also of some legends especially mentioned above, is printed in vol. 1. of my *Indische Streifen* (1853)

¹¹⁷ Poer's translation (1856) includes the commentary of the first *adhyāya*, he also gives several extracts from it in the subsequent chapters.

Antisri, and Kārshnaji are named. We meet with the three last of these elsewhere only¹¹⁹ in the Vedānta Sūtra of Badarayana, Bādarī excepted, who appears also in the Mīmāṃsā Sūtra of Jaimini. Vatsya is a name which occasionally occurs in the Vāuśas of the Śatapatha-Brahmana,¹²⁰ and the same applies to Jatūkarnya, who appears in the Vāuśa of the Madhu- and Yajñavalkya-landes in the Kanva recension as a pupil of Āsurayana and of Yāśka. (In the Madhyamdina recension, another teacher intervenes between the last-named and Jatūkarnya, viz, Bhadravajra.) He is also mentioned in the Āitareya-Āraṇyaka, and repeatedly in the Pratiśākhya-Sūtra of the White Yajus. Besides these, "*etc*" are frequently quoted, whereby reference is made to other Śākhās. One passage gives expression to a certain hostility towards the descendants of the daughter of Atri (the Haleyas, Valeyas, Kaudreyas, Śaṅbhreyas, Vamarathyas, Gopavanas), while the descendants of Atri himself are held in especial honour. A similar hostility is exhibited in other passages towards the descendants of Kanva, Kaśyapa, and Kautsa, yet these three words, according to the commentaries, may also be taken as appellatives, *kanva* as "deaf," *kaśyapa* as "having black teeth" (*śyādiadanta*), and *kautsa* as "doing blamable things." The first *adhyāya* is of peculiar interest, as it gives the *paribhāṣās*, or general rules for the sacrificial ceremonial. Otherwise this work, being entirely based upon the Brahmana, and therefore in no way an independent production, contains but few data throwing light upon its probable age. Amongst such we may reckon in particular* the circumstance that the word *vijaya*, "conquest," &c. of the

¹¹⁹ *Āśāṅkṛitā* appears as a grammarian also, he is possibly even earlier than Pāṇini, see *J. St.* xii. 28 413. On a Vedic commentator *Āśāṅkṛitā*, see above, pp. 42, 91.

¹²⁰ In addition to this there is quoted in ix. 5 1 62 the opinion of a teacher bearing the name *Vāśa* is mentioned in the Āitar Ār. and Śāṅkh Ār.

* The use of *manu* ix. 7 1, to denote 101 *manu* & so be instanced as

pointing to later times, it belongs to the same class as *agni* = 3 *Ā.* = 1, &c. [This is wrong, a little before, in xi. 5 16 mention is made of 101 *manu*, and in xi. 7 1 we have simply a reference back to this. We might rather cite *pāyāśramas* and &c. ix. 11 21 ff., in the sense of 24 &c., but there is this material difference from the later use, that it is *rotgāṣṭa*, &c. which are 24, but *gaurāśramas*]

points of the compass,* is once used in the sense of "the points of the compass" themselves (xx. 4. 26), which evidently presupposes the custom of the *dig-vyayas*—probably also poetical descriptions of them (?). The *adhýdyas* relating to the Saman ceremonial (xxii–xxiv) are the richest in this kind of data. They treat, for instance, like the Samā-Sūtras, of the sacrifices on the Sarasvatī, and also of the Vratya-sacrifices, at which we find the *Māgadhadēśīya brahmabandhu* (xxii. 4. 22) occupying the same position as in Latyayana.

The Kātyāyana-Sūtra has had many commentators, as Yāśoga,¹⁵¹ Pitrībhūti, Karka (quoted by Sayana, and therefore prior to him¹⁵²), Bhartṛiyajña, Śrī-Ananta, Devayajñika (or Yajñikadeva), and Mahadeva. The works of the three last,† and that of Karka are, however, the only ones that seem to have been preserved. The text, with extracts from these commentaries will form the third part of my edition of the White Yajus.¹⁵³—To this Sūtra a multitude

* See Lassen, *I AK.*, i. 542 [According to the St. Petersburg Dictionary, the word in the above passage should only mean 'gam, the thing conquered, booty' but a reference to locality is made certain by the parallel passage, *Lāty*, ix. 10. 17 *vyāzayaś ca madhye yajet (yo yajeta deśo vyāśaś syāt, sa tāzayaś m. y.)*, for the *digvyayas*, it is true, we do not gain anything by this passage.]

† This name must be read Yāśoga-gopi; see my edition, *Introd.*, p. vii.

‡ A *Dhūmrīyanasagotra Karka dīpikā* occurs in an inscription published by Dawson in *Journal R. A. S.*, i. 283 (1865) of Śrīdattakuśāh (Prāśāntarāja), dated a.m. 380 (but of what era?).

† [They are, however incomplete, in part exceedingly so.] The earliest MS. hitherto known of the *vyākhyat* of Yajñikadeva is dated samvat 1639.—I have given the names of these commentators in the order in which they are cited by one another, no doubt there were other commentators also preceding Yāśoga [Yāśogopi]. In the Fort William

Catalogue, under No. 742, a commentary by Mahādhara is mentioned, but I question provisionally the correctness of this statement. [The correct order is Karka, Pitrībhūti, Yāśogopi, Bhartṛiyajña. They are so cited by Ananta, who himself seems to have lived in the first half of the sixteenth century, provided he be really identical with the Śrīmadanantākhyachaturmāsyavāṛjīn, whom Nārāyaṇa, the author of the *Mahārtamārtāṇḍa*, mentions as his father, see my Catalogue of the Berlin MSS., No. 879. Deva on l. 10. 13 quotes a Nārāyaṇabhāṣya, might not Ananta's son be its author?]]

¹⁵³ This part was published 1856–59; Deva's Paddhati to books i.–v is there given in full, also his commentary on book i., the extracts from the scholia to books ii.–xi. are likewise taken from Deva's commentary those to books ii.–v there exhibit, as to style, some differences from the original wording resulting from abbreviations, the extracts for books xii.–xxvi. come from the scholium of Karka and from an an-

of Paddhatis (outlines), extracts, and similar works * attach themselves, and also a large number of *Parīśiṣṭas* (supplements), which are all attributed to *Katyayana*, and have found many commentators. Of these, we must specially draw attention to the *Niyama-Parīśiṣṭa*, a kind of synonymic glossary to the White Yajus, and to the *Pratard-dhyāya*,† an enumeration of the different families of the Brahmans, with a view to the proper selection of the sacrificial priests, as well as for the regulation of the inter-marriages forbidden or permissible among them. The *Charana-vyūha*, an account of the schools belonging to the several Vedas, is of little value. Its statements may for the most part be correct, but it is extremely incomplete, and from beginning to end is evidently quite a modern compilation.¹⁵⁴

The *Sūtra* of *Vaiyārāpa*, to which I occasionally find allusion in the commentaries on the *Kāṭiya-Sūtra*, I am inclined to class among the *Sūtras* of the White Yajus, as I do not meet with this name anywhere else except in the *Varāṇas* of the *Śatap Br*. Here we have both a *Vaiyāvapa* and a *Vaiyāvāpayana*, both appearing among the most recent members of the lists (in the *Kanva* recension I find only the latter, and he is here separated by five steps only from *Yaska*). A *Grihya-Sūtra* of this name is also cited.

The *Kāṭiya Grihya-Sūtra*,¹⁵⁵ in three *kāṇḍas*, is attributed to *Paraskara*, from whom a school of the White

nymous epitome (*samkṣiptasūtra*) of *Deva*, the MS of which dates from about 1609. None of these commentaries is complete.

* By *Gaddādhara Hanharamuḍra*, *Penudīkshta Gaṅgādhara* &c.

† Printed, but unfortunately from a very bad codex in my Catalogue of the Berlin MSS, pp. 54-62. [See *I St*, x. 88, ff.]

¹⁵⁴ Edited in *I St*, iii. 247-283 (1854), see also *Müller A S L* p. 368, ff., and *Rājendra Lāla Mitra* in the preface to his translation of the *Chhāndogyaopaniṣad*, p. 3. The enumerations of the Vedic schools in the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* in 4, and especially in the *Vāru Purāṇa*, chap. 12. (see *Aufrecht's Catalogus*, p. 54,

ff.) contain by far richer material. If all these schools actually existed—but there is certainly a great deal of mere error and embellishment in these statements—then, in truth, lamentably little has been left to us.

¹⁵⁵ See *Stenzler's* account of its contents in *Z D M G*, vii. (1833) and his essay on the *arghādīna* (*Pār*, i. 8, Breslau 1855). The sections on marriage ceremonial have been published by *Haaas*, *I St*, v. 283 ff., whilst the sections on the *śāntakarma* have been edited by *Speijer* (1872) together with critical variants (pp. 17-23) to the MS of the whole text which was used by *Stenzler*.

Yajus also (according to the Charanavyūha) derived its name. The word Paraskara is used as a *samjñā*, or proper name—but, according to the *gana*, to denote a district—in the Sūtra of Panini, but I am unable to trace it in Vedic literature. To this Grihya-Sūtra there are still extant a Paddhati by Vāsudeva, a commentary by Jayarama, and above all a most excellent commentary by Ramakrishna under the title of *Samsāra-ganapati*, which ranks above all similar works from its abundant quotations and its very detailed and exhaustive handling of the various subjects. In the introduction, which deals with the Veda in general and the Yajurveda in particular, Ramakrishna declares that the Kanva school is the best of those belonging to the Yajus—Under the name of Paraskara there exists also a Smṛiti-Sastra, which is in all probability based upon this Grihya-Sūtra. Among the remaining Smṛiti-Sāstras, too, there are a considerable number whose names are connected with those of teachers of the White Yajus, for instance, Yajnavalkya, whose posteriority to Manu quite corresponds to the posteriority of the White Yajus to the Black Yajus—and no doubt also to that of the Katya-Sūtra to the Manava-Sūtra,—further, Katyayana (whose work, however, as we saw, connects itself with the Samaveda), Kanva, Gautama, Sandilya, Jabali, and Parāśara. The last two names appear among the schools of the White Yajus specified in the Charanavyūha, and we also find members of their families named in the Vāṇsas of the Satapatha-Brahmana, where the family of the Parāśaras is particularly often represented.*

The *Prātisākhya-Sūtra* of the White Yajus, as well as its Anukramanī, names at its close Katyayana as its author. In the body of the work there is mention, first, of three grammarians, whom we also find cited in the *Prātisākhya* of the Rik, in Yaska, and in Panini, viz., Sskatayana, Sakalya, and Gargya, next, of Kāśyapa, likewise mentioned by Panini, and, lastly, of Dalbhya, Jātukarnya, Saunaka (the author of the Rik-*Prātisākhya*?), Aupāsivi,

* [See I St., 1. 156.] Panini, iv 3. 110 (a rule which possibly does not belong to him), attributes to a *Pārśārya* a *Bhikṣu Sūtra*, i.e. a compendium for religious medi-

cants. [The *Pārśārya* *Śikṣasūtra* are mentioned in the *Mahābhāṣya* also, and besides a *Kalpa* by *Pārśara*, see I St., III. 3. 0, 445.]

Kaṇva, and the Mādhyamīnaś. The distinction in I. 18, 19 between *veda* and *śāśhya*, i.e., works in *śāśhā*,—which corresponds to the use of the latter word in Pāṇini,—has already been mentioned (p. 57). The first of the eight *adhyāyas* contains the *saṃyās* and *paribhāṣās*, i.e., technical terms* and general preliminary remarks. The second *adhy* treats of the accent, the third, fourth, and fifth of *samskāra*, i.e., of loss, addition, alteration, and constancy of the letters with reference to the laws of euphony, the sixth of the accent of the verb in the sentence, &c., the eighth contains a table of the vowels and consonants, lays down rules on the manner of reading¹²⁶ (*svādhyāya*), and gives a division of words corresponding to that of Yaska. Here, too, several *śloka*s are quoted referring to the duties of the letters and words, so that I am almost inclined to consider this last *adhyāya* (which is, moreover, strictly speaking, contained in the first) as a later addition†. We have an excellent commentary on this work by Uvata, who has been repeatedly mentioned, under the title of *Mātrimodaka*¹²⁷.

The *Anukramanī* of Katyāyana contains, in the first place, in the first four *adhyāyas* (down to IV 9), an index of the authors, duties, and metres of the several *śūlānī yajūnśi* "White Yajus formulas" contained in the "*Mādhyamīniye Vājasaneyake Yajurvedāmnāye sarve* [?] *sakhile saśulāriye*," which the saint Yajñavalkya received from Vivasvant, the sun-god. For their *vinīyoga*, or liturgical use, we are referred to the *Kalpakra*. As regards the names of authors here mentioned, there is much to be remarked. The authors given for the *richas* usually agree with those assigned to the same verses in the *Rig anukramanī*, there are, however, many exceptions to this. Very often the particular name appears (as is also the case in

* Among them *śiṣ*, *krat*, *śāśhita* and *upadā* terms quite agreeing with Pāṇini's terminology.

¹²⁶ Rather "reciting," because here too we must dismiss all idea of writing and reading.

† In that case the mention of the Mādhyamīnaś would go for nothing.

¹²⁷ In connection with my edition of this *Pratīśāhya* text and trans-

lation, with critical introduction and explanatory notes in *I St.*, IV 65-160 177-331 Goldstücker in his *Pāṇini*, pp. 186-207, started a special controversy, in which inter alia he attempts in particular to show that the author of this work is identical with the author of the *virtuālas* to Pāṇini, see my detailed rejoinder in *I St.*, v 91-124.

the Rig anukramanī) to be borrowed from some word occurring in the verse. In the case where a passage is repeated elsewhere, as very often happens, it is frequently assigned to an author different from the one to whom it had previously been attributed. Many of the Rishis here mentioned do not occur among those of the Rik, and belong to a later stage than these, among them are several even of the teachers mentioned in the Śatapatha-Brahmana. The closing part of the fourth *adhyāya** contains the dedication of the verses to be recited at particular ceremonies to their respective Rishis, deities, and metres, together with other similar mystical distributions. Lastly, the fifth *adhyāya* gives a short analysis of the metres which occur. In the excellent but unfortunately not altogether complete Paddhati of Śrīhala to this Anukramanī we find the liturgical use of each individual verse also given in detail.

The Yajus recension of the three works called Vedāṅgas, viz., Śikshā, Chhandas, and Jyotiṣha, has already been discussed (p. 60)†

We come now to the *Atharvaveda*

The *Samhitā* of the Atharvaveda contains in twenty *kāndas*¹⁻³ and thirty eight *prapāṭhakas* nearly 760 hymns and about 6000 verses. Besides the division into *prapāṭhakas*, another into *anuvākas* is given, of which there are

* Published together with the fifth *adhyāya*, and the beginning of the work, in my edition of the Vājasaneyi Samhitā, introduction, pp. lv-lviii.

† For particulars I refer to my Catalogue of the Berlin MSS., pp. 96-100 [and to my editions, already mentioned, of these three tracts].

¹²⁸ This division of the Ath. S

into twenty books is attested for the period of the author of the *śrīhala*, and also by the Gopatha Brāhmana 1. 8, see *I St.*, xii. 433, whereas both the Ath. S. itself (19. 22, 23) and the Ath. Par. 48. 4-6 still contain the direct intimation that it formerly consisted of sixteen books only, see *I St.*, iv. 432-434.

some ninety. The division into *parvans*, mentioned in the thirteenth book of the Śatapatha-Brahmana, does not appear in the manuscripts, neither do they state to what school the existing text belongs. As, however, in one of the *Parīśishtas* to be mentioned hereafter (the seventh), the *richas* belonging to the ceremony there in question are quoted as *Paippalādā mantrāḥ*, it is at least certain that there was a *Samhitā* belonging to the Paippalada school, and possibly this may be the *Samhitā* now extant.¹⁵⁹ Its contents and principle of division are at present unknown¹⁶⁰ in their details. We only know generally that "it principally contains formulas intended to protect against the baneful influences of the divine powers,* against diseases and noxious animals, cursings of enemies, invocations of healing herbs, together with formulas for all manner of occurrences in every-day life, prayers for protection on journeys, luck in gaming, and the like"†—all matters for which analogies enough are to be found in the hymns of the Rik-Samhitā. But in the Rik the instances are both less numerous and, as already remarked in the introduction (p. 11), they are handled in an entirely different manner, although at the same time a not inconsiderable portion of these songs reappears directly in the Rik, particularly in the tenth *mandala*.* As to the ceremonial for which the hymns of the Atharvan were used, what corre-

¹⁵⁹ According to a tract recently published by Roth, *Der Atharvaveda in Kashmir* (1875), this is not the case, the extant Samhitā seems rather to belong to the school of the Śaunakas, whilst the Paippalādī Samhitā has come down to us in a second recension, still preserved in Kashmir.

¹⁶⁰ The arrangement in books i-vii is according to the number of verses in the different pieces, these have, on an average four verses in book i, five in ii, six in iii, seven in iv, eight to eighteen in v, three in vi, and only one in vii. Books viii-xiii contain longer pieces. As to the contents, they are indiscriminately mixed up. Books xiv-xviii, on the contrary, have all a uniform subject-matter, xiv treats of mar-

riage, xv of the glorification of Vratya, xvi, xvii of certain conjurations, xviii of burial and the festival of the Manes. Book xix is a mixture of supplementary pieces, part of its text being in a rather corrupt condition, book xx contains,—with one peculiar exception, the so-called *ṛṇādrasāḥ*,—only complete hymns addressed to Indra, which are borrowed directly and without change from the Rigveda. Neither of these two last books is noticed in the Atharva Prātisākhya (see note 167), and therefore they did not belong to the original text at the time of this work.

* Of the stars, too, i.e., of the lunar asterisms.

† See Roth *Zur Litt. und Gesch. des Weda*, p. 12.

sponds to it in the other Vedas is found, not in the Śrauta-Sūtras, but with few exceptions in the Grihya-Sūtras only, and it appears therefore (as I have likewise already remarked) that this ceremonial in its origin belonged rather to the people proper than to the families of priests. As in the Shadviṃśa-Brāhmaṇa and in the Sama Sūtras we actually meet with a case (see p 78) where an imprecatory ceremony is borrowed from the Vratīnas, or Aryans who had not adopted the Brahmanical organisation, we may further reasonably conjecture that this was not a solitary instance, and thus the view naturally presents itself that, though the Atharva-Samhitā originated for the most part in the Brahmanical period, yet songs and formulas may also have been incorporated into it which properly belonged to these unbrahmanical Aryans of the west*. And as a matter of fact, a very peculiar relation to these tribes is unmistakably revealed in the fifteenth *kāṇḍa*, where the Supreme Being is expressly called by the name of Vratya,¹²¹ and is at the same time associated with the attributes given in the Samaveda as characteristics of the Vratyas. In the same way, too, we find this word Vratya employed in the Atharva Upanishads in the sense of "pure in himself" to denote the Supreme Being. The mention of the *māgadha* in the Vratya-book, and the possibility that this word may refer to anti-brahmanical Buddhist teachers, have already been discussed (p 112). In a passage communicated by Roth, *op c* p 38, special, and hostile, notice is taken of the Angas and Magadhas in the East, as well as of the Gandhāris, Mūjavants, Śūdras, Mahavrishas, and Valhikas in the North-West, between which tribes therefore the Brahmanical district was apparently shut in at the time of the composition of the song in question. Intercourse with the West appears to have been more active than with the East, five of the races settled in the West being mentioned, and two only of those belonging to the

* In the Visṇu Purāṇa the Saindhavas, Saundhavyakas are mentioned as a school of the Atharvan.

¹²¹ This explanation of the contents of this book and of the word *vrātya* is based upon its employment in the Prāśnopanishad 2 7, and in

the Chāṇikopanishad, v 11 (see *J. St.*, i. 445, 446, ix. 15, 16). According to Roth on the contrary (see above p. 112, note) the purpose of the book is rather "the idealising of the devout vagrant or mendicant (*parivrajaka*, &c.)."

East. In time it will certainly be possible, in the Atharva Samhita also, to distinguish between pieces that are older and pieces that are more modern although upon the whole geographical data are of rare occurrence. Its language exhibits many very peculiar forms of words, often in a very antique although prakritized shape. It contains, in fact, a mass of words used by the people which from lack of occasion found no place in the other branches of the literature. The enumeration of the lunar asterisms in the nineteenth *Ānda* begins with *kruttikā*, just as in the Taittirīya-Samhitā, but otherwise it deviates considerably from the latter, and gives for the most part the forms of the names used in later times¹⁵². No direct determination of date, however, can be gathered from it as Colebrooke imagined. Of special interest is the mention of the Asura Krishna * Kēśin, from the slaying of whom Krishna (Āṅgīrasa², Devakīputra) receives the epithets of Kēśhan, Kēśisūdana in the Epic and in the Puranas. In those hymns which appear also in the Rik Samhita (mostly in its last *mandala*), the variations are often very considerable, and these readings seem for the most part equally warranted with those of the Rik. There are also many points of contact with the Yajus.

The earliest mention of the Atharvan-songs occurs under the two names "Atharvanas" and "Āṅgīrasas," names which belong to the two most ancient Rishi-families, or to the common ancestors of the Indo-Aryans and the Persa-Aryans, and which are probably only given to these songs in order to lend all the greater authority and holiness to the incantations, &c., contained in them†. They are also often specially connected with the ancient family of the Bhrigus¹⁵³. Whether we have to take the "Athar-

¹⁵² The piece in question proves, on special grounds to be a later supplement, see *J. St.*, iv 433 n.

* An Asura Krishna we find even in the Rik Samhitā, and he plays a prominent part in the Buddhist legends (in which he seems to be identified with the Kṛṣṇa of the epic (?)

† See *J. St.*, i 295 ff. That these names indicate any Persa Aryan influence is not to be thought of,

and if according to the Bhavishya Purāṇa (Wilson in Pernoud's *Mém. sur l'Inde* p 394) the Parsis (Magas) have four Vedas, the Veda ('Yasna') Viśvavada (Viśpered) Vidut (Vendidad) and Āgīrasa, this is a purely Indian view, though indeed very remarkable.

¹⁵³ See my essay *Zwei vedische Texte über Omina und Portenta*, pp 346-348

vāṅs" in the thirtieth book of the Vaj Samhita as Atharvan-songs is not yet certain, but for the period to which the eleventh, thirteenth, and fourteenth books of the Satapatha Brahmana, as well as the Chhândogyaopaniṣad and the Taittiriya Āraṇyaka (II and VIII), belong, the existence of the Atharvan-songs and of the Atharvaveda is fully established by the mention of them in these works. The thirteenth book of the Satapatha-Brahmana even mentions a division into *parrans*,* which, as already remarked, no longer appears in the manuscripts. In the eighth book of the Taittiriya-Āraṇyaka, the *ādīśa*, i.e., the Brahmana, is inserted between the three other Vedas and the "Atharvaṅgrasas." Besides these notices, I find the Atharvaveda or more precisely the "Atharvanikas," only mentioned in the Nidana-Sūtra of the Samaveda (and in Panini). The names, too, which belong to the schools of the Atharvaveda appear nowhere in Vedic literature,† with the exception perhaps of Kauśika, still, this patronymic does not by any means involve a special reference to the Atharvan‡. Another name, which is, however, only applied to the Atharvaveda in the later Atharvan-writings themselves, viz., in the Parīśiṣṭas, is "Brahma veda." This is explained by the circumstance that it claims to be the Veda for the chief sacrificial priest, the Brahman,¹⁶⁴ while the other Vedas are represented as those of his assistants only, the Hotar, Udgatar, and Adhvaryu,

* Corresponding to the *śāltas*, *anurūṭas* and *dyāts* of the Rik, Yajus and Sāman respectively.

† Members of the family of the Atharvans are now and then mentioned, thus especially Dadhyāśeh Ath., Kabandha Ath., whom the Vishnu Purana designates as a pupil of Sumantu (the latter we met in the Gṛhya Sūtras of the Rik, see above, p. 57) and others.

‡ It seems that even in later times the claim of the Atharvan to rank as Veda was disputed. Yājñavalkya (I. 101) mentions the two separately *vādīśharas*, though in another passage (I. 44) the "Atharvaṅgrasas" occur along with Rik, Sāman, and Yajus. In Manu's Code we only once find the *śruti*

atharvāṅgrasas, as magic formulas; in the Rāmāyaṇa likewise only once II. 26. 20 (Gorr.) the *śāntarīśa* *ādīśharas* (the latter passage I overlooked in I St., I, 297). (In Patanjali's Maṇabhaṣya, however, the Atharvan is cited at the head of the Vedas (as in the Rik Gṛhyas, see above, p. 58) occasionally even as their only representative, see I St., III 431-32.)

¹⁶⁴ This explanation of the name, though the traditional one is yet very likely erroneous by Brahma veda (a name which is first mentioned in the Śākh Gṛhya, I. 16) we have rather to understand the Veda of brahmins, of prayers i.e., here in the narrower sense of "incantations." (St. Petersburg Dict.)

—a claim which has probably no other foundation than the circumstance, cleverly turned to account, that there was, in fact, no particular Veda for the Brahman, who was bound to know all three, as is expressly required in the Kaushîtaki-Brahmana (see *I St.*, n 305). Now the weaker these pretensions are, the more strongly are they put forward in the Atharvan-writings, which indeed display a very great animosity to the other Vedas. Towards one another, too, they show a hostile enough spirit, for instance, one of the *Parîśistas* considers a *Bhârgava*, *Paippalada*, and *Saunaka* alone worthy to act as priest to the king,* while a *Mauda* or *Jalada* as *purohita* would only bring misfortune.

The Atharva Samhitâ also, it seems, was commented upon by Sâyaṇa. Manuscripts of it are comparatively rare on the Continent. Most of them are distinguished by a peculiar mode of accentuation†. A piece of the Samhitâ of some length has been made known to us in text and translation by Aufrecht (*I St.*, i 121-140), besides this, only some fragments have been published.¹⁶⁵

The Brahmana-stage is but very feebly represented in the Atharvaveda, viz., by the *Gopatha Brâhmana*, which, in the manuscript with which I am acquainted (*E. I. H.*, 2142), comprises a *pûrva*- and an *uttara*-portion, each containing five *prapâśhakas*, the MS, however, breaks off with the beginning of a sixth (i.e., the eleventh) *prapâ-*

* Yâjñavalkya (i 312) also requires that such an one be well versed *atharvedîgrosat*.

† Dots are here used instead of lines, and the *swarita* stands mostly beside, not above, the *akshara*.

¹⁶⁵ The whole text has been edited long since (1855-56) by Roth and Whitney. The first two books have been translated by me in *I St.*, iv 393-430, and xiii 129-216, and the nuptial formulas contained in the fourteenth book, together with a great variety of love charms and similar formulas from the remaining books *ibid.*, v 204-266. For the criticism of the text see Roth's tract, *Ueber den Atharvaveda* (1856), and *Der Atharvaveda* in

Ka. Amr. (1875). In the *Gopatha Brâhmana* (i. 29), and in *Patanjali's Mahâbhâṣya* (see *I St.*, xiii. 433, although, according to Burnell, *Intro. to Veda's Brâhmana*, p. xxii, the South Indian MSS. omit the quotation from the Atharvaveda), the beginning of the Samhitâ is given otherwise than in our text, as it commences with i 6, instead of i. 1. It is similarly given by Bhagparker, *Indian Antiquary* in 132, and two MSS. in Haug's possession actually begin the text in this manner: see Haug's *Brahman und die Brahmanen* p. 45.—Burnell (*Intro. to Veda's Br.*, p. xxi) doubts whether the Ath. S. was commented by Sâyaṇa.

phaka - In one of the *Parīśiṣṭas* the work is stated to have originally contained 100 *prapāṭhakas*. The contents are entirely unknown to me. According to Colebrooke's remarks on the subject, Atharvan is here represented as a *Prajapati* who is appointed by Brahman as a *Demurge*, and this is, in fact, the position which he occupies in the *Parīśiṣṭas* and some of the *Upanishads*. The division of the year into twelve (or thirteen) months consisting of 360 days, and of each day into thirty *muhūrtas*, which Colebrooke points out as remarkable, equally appears in the *Brahmanas* of the *Yajus*, &c.¹⁶⁶

Departing from the order hitherto followed I will add here what I have to say about the *Sūtras* of the *Atharva-veda*, as these are the only other writings which have reference to the *Samhita*, whereas the remaining parts of the *Atharvan-literature*, corresponding to the *Āraṇyakas* of the other *Vedas*, have no reference to it whatever.

In the first place, I have to mention the *Śaunakiyā chatur-adhyāyikā*,^{166a} a kind of *Pratīśākhya* for the *Atharva-Samhita*, in four *adhyāyas*, which might possibly go back to the author of the *Rik-Pratīśākhya*, who is also mentioned in the *Pratīśākhya* of the *White Yajus*. The *Śaunakas* are named in the *Charanavyūha* as a school of the *Atharvan*, and members of this school are repeatedly mentioned in the *Upanishads*. The work bears here and there a more generally grammatical character than is the case with the remaining *Pratīśākhyas*. Śaka-

¹⁶⁶ M. Muller first gave us some information as to the *Gopatha Brāhmaṇa* in his *History of A. S. L.*, p. 445-455, and now the work itself has been published by Rājendra Lalā Mitra and Harachandra Vidyābhāṣana in the *Bibl. Indica* (1870-72). According to this it consists of eleven (i.e., 5+6) *prapāṭhakas* only. We do not discover in it any special relation to the *Ath. S.*, apart from several references thereto under different names. The contents are a medley to a large extent derived from other sources. The first half is essentially of speculative, cosmogonic import, and is particularly rich in legends, a good number

of which appear in the same forms as in the *Satapatha Brāhmaṇa*, xi. xii., and are therefore probably simply copied from it. The second half contains a brief exposition of a variety of points connected with the *Śrauta* ritual, specially adapted, as it seems from the *Aitar Br.* Very remarkable is the assumption in i. 28 of a *daśapati*, lord of evil (17), who at the beginning of the *Dvāpara* (yuga) is supposed to have acted as '*pūṣṭam ekadēśak*'. This reminds us of, and doubtless rests upon, the *Māra* of the *Buddhists*.

^{166a} The form of name in the MS. is *chaturādhyāyikā*.

tāyana and other grammatical teachers are mentioned. In the Berlin MS—the only one as yet known—each rule is followed by its commentary¹⁵⁷

An *Anukramant* to the Atharva-Samhitā is also extant, it, however, specifies for the most part only divine beings, and seldom actual Rishis, as authors

The *Kaṣika-Sūtra* is the sole existing ritual Sūtra of the Atharvaveda, although I am acquainted with an Atharvana-Grihya through quotations¹⁵⁸. It consists of fourteen *adhyāyas*, and in the course of it the several doctrines are repeatedly ascribed to Kaṣika. In the introduction it gives as its authorities the Mantras and the Brahmanas, and failing these the *sampradāya*, i.e., tradition, and in the body of the work the Brahmana is likewise frequently appealed to (by *iti br*), whether by this the Gopatha-Brahmana is intended I am unable to say. The style of the work is in general less concise than that of the other Sūtras, and more narrative. The contents are precisely those of a Grihya-Sūtra. The third *adhyāya* treats of the ceremonial for Nirriti (the goddess of misfortune), the fourth gives *bhaishajyas*, healing remedies, the sixth, &c., imprecations, magical spells, the tenth treats of marriage, the eleventh of the Manes-sacrifice, the thirteenth and fourteenth of expiatory ceremonies for various omens and portents (like the Adbhuta-Brahmana of the Sāmaveda)¹⁵⁹

¹⁵⁷ Of this Prātiśākhya also Whitney has given us an excellent edition in *Journal Am. Or. Soc.*, vii (1862), x 156, ff. (1872, additions). See also my remarks in *J. St.*, iv 79-82. According to Whitney, this work takes no notice of the two last books of the existing Ath. text, which it otherwise follows closely, since therefore the Atharva Samhitā in Patanjali's time already comprised twenty books, we might from this directly infer the priority of the Saun. chat., unless Patanjali's statement refer not to our text at all, but rather to that of the Paippalīda school, see Roth, *Der Atharva vedā in Kashmir*, p. 15 — Bühler has discovered another quite different Ath. Prātiśākhya, see *Monatsber. of the Berl. Acad.* 1871, p. 77

¹⁵⁸ By which is doubtless meant just this Kaṣika Sūtra. A Śrauta Sūtra belonging to the Atharvaveda has recently come to light, under the name of Vaitāna Sūtra; see Haug, *J. St.*, ix 176, Bühler, *Cat. of MSS. from Gujarat*, I. 190, and *Monatsberichte of the Berl. Acad.* 1871, p. 76, and some fuller accounts in Roth's *Atharvaveda in Kashmir*, p. 22

¹⁵⁹ These two sections are published, with translation and notes, in my essay, *Zwei vedische Texte über Omens und Portents* (1859), the section relating to marriage ceremonies is communicated in a paper by Haas, *Ueber die Heirathsgebräuche der alten Inder* in *J. St.*, v 378, ff.

To this Sūtra belong further five so-called *Kalpas* the *Nakshatra-Kalpa*, an astrological compendium relating to the lunar mansions, in fifty *handikās*, the *Śānti-Kalpa*, in twenty-five *handikās*, which treats likewise of the adoration of the lunar mansions,¹⁷⁰ and contains prayers addressed to them, the *Vidāna-Kalpa*, the *Samhitā-Kalpa*, and the *Abhichāra-Kalpa*. The *Vishnu-Purana* and the *Charanavyūha*, to be presently mentioned, name, instead of the last, the *Āṅgirasa-Kalpa*. Further, seventy-four smaller *Parīśishtas*¹⁷¹ also belong to it, mostly composed in *ślohas*, and in the form of dialogues, like the *Puranas*. The contents are Grihya-subjects of various kinds, astrology,¹⁷² magic, and the doctrine concerning omens and portents are most largely represented. Some sections correspond almost literally to passages of a like nature in the astrological *Samhitas*. Among these *Parīśishtas*, there is also a *Charana-vyūha*, which states the number of the *richas* in the *Atharva-Samhita* at 12,380, that of the *paryāyas* (hymns) at 2000, but the number of the *Kausīkoṭṭāni parīśiṣṭāni* only at 70. Of teachers who are mentioned the following are the chief: first, *Bṛhaspati Atharvan*, *Bhagavant Atharvan* himself, *Bṛigu*, *Bhargava*, *Āṅgras*, *Āṅgirasa*, *Kāvya* (or *Kavi*) *Uśanas*, then *Śaunaka*, *Narada*, *Gautama*, *Kamkāyana*, *Karmāgha*, *Pippalada*, *Mahakī*, *Garga*, *Gargya*, *Vṛddhagarga*, *Ātreya*, *Padmayoni*, *Kraushthi*. We meet with many of these names again in the astrological literature proper.

I now turn to the most characteristic part of the literature of the *Atharvan*, viz, the *Upanishads*. Whilst the *Upanishads* κατ' ἐξοχήν so called, of the remaining *Vedas* all belong to the later, or even the latest, portions of these

¹⁷⁰ An account of the contents of both texts is given in my second essay on the *Nakshatras* pp 390-393 (1862), Haug in *I St.*, ix 174, mentions an *Aranyaka Jyotiṣa*, different from the *Nakshatra Kalpa*.

¹⁷¹ Haug *l c.*, speaks of 72, amongst them is found a *Nighānta*, which is wanting in the Berlin MS. Compare the *Nigama Parīśiṣṭa* of the *White Yajur*.—Texts of this

kind are quoted even in the *Mahābhāṣya*, see *I St.*, xiv 463.

¹⁷² One of the *Parīśiṣṭas* relating to this subject has been communicated by me in *I St.*, x 317 ff., it is the fifty first of the series. The statements found therein concerning the planets presuppose the existence of Greek influences, cf *ibid.*, p 319, viii 413.

Vedas, they at least observe a certain limit which they never transgress, that is to say, they keep within the range of inquiry into the nature of the Supreme Spirit, without serving sectarian purposes. The Atharvan Upanishads, on the contrary, come down as far as the time of the Purāṇas, and in their final phases they distinctly enter the lists in behalf of sectarian views. Their number is as yet undetermined. Usually only fifty-two are enumerated. But as among these there are several which are of quite modern date, I do not see why we should separate these fifty-two Upanishads from the remaining similar tracts which, although not contained in the usual list, nevertheless call themselves Upanishads, or Atharvopani- shads, more especially as this list varies in part according to the different works where it is found, and as the manuscripts mix up these fifty-two with the remaining Upanishads indiscriminately. Indeed, with regard to the Upanishad literature we have this peculiar state of things that it may extend down to very recent times, and consequently the number of writings to be reckoned as belonging to it is very considerable. Two years ago, in the second part of the *Indische Studien*, I stated the number at ninety-five including the Upanishads contained in the older Vedas*. The researches instituted by Walter Elliot in Masulipatam among the Telingana Brahmans on this subject have, however, as Dr Roer writes to me, yielded the result that among these Brahmans there are

* This number is wrong, it ought to be ninety three. I there counted the Anandavalli and Bhṛiguvaḥni twice, first among the twenty three Atharvopaniśads omitted by Anquetil, and then among the nine Upanishads borrowed from the other Vedas which are found in his work. The number would further have to be reduced to ninety two since I cite Colebrooke's *Ampitwināda* and Anquetil's *Ampitwināda* as distinct Upanishads, whereas in point of fact they are identical, but then, on the other hand, two Upanishads identified by me ought to be kept distinct, viz. Colebrooke's *Prāpāgnihotra* and Anquetil's *Prasou*, the latter (*Prap-*

vopaniśad) being different from the former.—The number now here finally arrived at—ninety six—is obtained (1) by the addition of six new Upanishads, viz. the Ekāhavi Upanishad, the Samvartop, the second Mahopaniśad, and three of the Upanishads contained in the Atharvashiras (Ganapati, Sūrya, Devī), (2) by the omission of two, the Pudropaniśad and the Atharvopāya Pudropaniśad which are possibly identical with others of those cited, and (3) by counting the Mahāndrāyopaniśad as only one, whereas Colebrooke counts it as two.

123 Upanishads actually extant, and if we include those which they do not possess, but which are contained in my list just referred to, the total is raised to 147*. A list of these 123 is given in two of them, viz, in the Mahavak-yamuktavali and in the Muktikopanishad, and is exactly the same in both. According to the statement given above, there must be among these 123 fifty-two† in all which are wanting in my own list, and these include the two names just mentioned—A Persian translation made in 1656 of fifty Upanishads is extant in Anquetil du Peron's Latin rendering.

If now we attempt to classify the Upanishads so far known, the most ancient naturally are those (1-12) which are found in the three older Vedas only‡. I have already remarked that these never pursue sectarian aims. A seeming—but only a seeming—exception to this is the *Śatarudriya*, for although the work has in fact been used for sectarian purposes, it had originally quite a different significance, which had nothing to do with the misapplication of it afterwards made, originally, indeed, it was not an Upanishad at all§. A real exception, however, is the *Śvetāśvataraopanishad* (13), which is in any case wrongly classed with the Black Yajur, it is only from its having incorporated many passages of the latter that it has been foisted in here. It belongs to about the same rank and date as the *Kaivalyopanishad*. Nor can the *Maitrāyana-Upanishad* (14) reasonably claim to be ranked with the Black

* According to the previous note, only 145.

† According to last note but one, only fifty. [In the list published by W. Elliot of the Upanishads in the Muktikopan., see *Journal As. Soc. Beng.*, 1851, p. 607, ff., 108 names are directly cited (and of these 93 are analysed singly in Taylor's *Catalogue* (1860) of the *Oriental MSS of Fort St. George*, ii. 457-474). But to these other names have to be added which are there omitted: see *I St.* in 324-326. The alphabetical list published by M. Müller in *Z D M G*, xix. 137-153 (1865), brings the number up to 149 (170, Burnell, *Indian Antiquary*, ii. 267).

Since then many new names have been brought to our knowledge by the Catalogues of MSS published by Burnell, Buhler, Kielhorn, Rājendra Lal Mitra, Haug (*Brahman und die Brahmanen*, pp. 29-31), &c., so that at present I count 235 Upanishads, many of which, however, are probably identical with others, as in many cases the names alone are at present known to us.]

‡ Namely, *Āitareya*, *Kausītaki*, *Vāhikā*, *Chhândogya*, *Śatarudriya*, *Śikshāvalli* or *Taitt. Samhitopanishad*, *Chhândogya* (II), *Tadara*, *Sivasamkalpa*, *Purushasukta*, *Isa*, *Vijñāna*, *Āranyaka*.

§ See on this *I St.*, ii. 14-47.

Yajus, it belongs rather, like the Śvetāśvataropaniṣad, only to the Yoga period. Still it does not, at least in the part known to me,¹⁷³ pursue any sectarian aim (see pp 96-99).

Apart from the two last-named Upaniṣads, the transition to the Atharvopaniṣads is formed on the one hand by those Upaniṣads which are found in one of the other three Vedas, as well as in a somewhat modified form in an Atharvan-recension, and on the other hand by those Upaniṣads of which the Atharvan-recension is the only one extant, although they may have formerly existed in the other Vedas as well. Of the latter we have only one instance, the *Kāthaka-Upaniṣad* (15, 16), of the former, on the contrary, there are several instances (17-20), viz., *Kena* (from the Samaveda), *Bṛiguvallī*, *Anandavallī*, and *Bṛihannārāyaṇa* (Taitt Ār, viii-ix.)

The Atharvopaniṣads, which are also distinguished externally by the fact that they are mostly composed in verse, may themselves be divided into three distinct classes, which in their beginnings follow the earlier Upaniṣads with about equal closeness. Those of the first class continue directly to investigate the nature of Ātman, or the Supreme Spirit, those of the second deal with the subject of absorption (*yoga*) in meditation thereon, and give the means whereby, and the stages in which, men may even in this world attain complete union with Ātman, and lastly, those of the third class substitute for Ātman some one of the many forms under which Śiva and Viṣṇu, the two principal gods, were in the course of time worshipped.

Before proceeding to discuss these three classes in their proper order, I have to make some observations on the Atharvan-recensions of those Upaniṣads which either belong at the same time to the other Vedas also, or at any rate originally did so.

The Atharvan-text of the Kenopaniṣad, in the first place, differs but very little from its Sāman text. The reason why this Upaniṣad has been incorporated into the Atharvan collection seems to be the fact that Umā Haimavatī is here (and for the first time) mentioned, as she

¹⁷³ In the remaining parts also there is nothing of the kind to be found.

was probably understood in the sense of the Śiva sects. With the Atharvan-text both of the *Ānandavallī* and of the *Bhṛiguavallī** I am unacquainted. Of the *Bṛihannarayanop* † also, which corresponds to the *Narayanīyop* of the *Taitt. Āraṇyaka*, only a few data are known to me, these, however, sufficiently show that the more ancient and obscure forms have here throughout been replaced by the corresponding later and regular ones. ‡—The two *Kathavallīs*, for the most part in metrical form, are extant in the Atharvan-text only §. The second is nothing but a supplement to the first, consisting as it does almost exclusively of quotations from the Vedas, intended to substantiate more fully the doctrines there set forth. The first is based upon a legend (see pp 92, 93) related in the *Taitt. Brahmana* [iii. 11 8]. Nachiketas, the son of *Āruni* || asks Death for a solution of his doubt whether man exists after death or not. After much reluctance, and after holding out enticements of all kinds, which Nachiketas withstands, Death at length initiates him into the mystery of existence. Life and death, he says, are but two different phases of development, true wisdom consists in the perception of identity with the Supreme Spirit, whereby men are elevated above life and death. The exposition in this first part is really impressive. The diction, too, is for the most part antique. A few passages, which do not harmonise at all with the remainder, seem either to have been inserted at a later time, or else, on the contrary, to have been retained

* Two lists of the Atharvopanishads in Chambers's Collection (see my Catalogue, p. 95) cite after these two *vallīs* (39, 40), also a *madhyavallī* and an *uttaravallī* (41, 42) †

† By Colebrooke it is reckoned as two Upanishads.

‡ Thus we have *śivasarya* instead of *śvaśaśarya*, *Kanyākūṇḍrīn* instead of *śrī*, *Kṛtīdyanja* instead of *śyandya*, &c.

§ See I St, ii. 195, ff., where the various translations and editions are cited. Since then this Upanishad has appeared in a new edition, with Śaṅkara's commentary in the *Bibl. Indica*, vol. viii., edited by Dr Roer (and translated in vol. xv.)

|| Two other names, which are given to the father of Nachiketas, viz. *Auddālaki* and *Vājasravasa*, conflict with the usual accounts. *Vājasravasa* appears also in the passage above referred to of the *Taitt. Āraṇyaka*, whether *Auddālaki* does so likewise I am unable to say. [*Auddālaki* is wanting in the f Br., as also the whole passage itself.] Benfey (in the *Göttinger Gelehrte Anzeigen*, January 1852, p. 129) suggests that we should refer *Auddālaki* *Āruni* to Nachiketas, but the incompatibility of the two names is not thereby removed. *Āruni* is *Uddālaka*, and *Auddālaki* is *Ārupeya*.

from a former exposition drawn up more for a liturgical purpose. Its polemics against those holding different opinions are very sharp and bitter. They are directed against *tarka*, "doubt," by which the Samkhya and Bauddhas are here probably intended. The sacredness of the word *om* as the expression for the eternal position of things is very specially emphasised a thing which has not occurred before in the same way. The gradation of the primeval principles (in III. 10, 11) exactly corresponds to the system of the deistical Yoga, whereas otherwise the exposition bears a purely Vedantic character.

Of the Atharvopaniṣads proper the *Mundaka*- and *Prasna*-Upaniṣads (21, 22) connect themselves most closely with the Upaniṣads of the older Vedas and with the Vedānta doctrine,^{17a} indeed, in the Vedānta-Sūtra of Bhaṭṭarāyaṇa reference is made to them quite as often as to these others. The *Mundaka-Upaniṣad*, mostly in verse, and so called because it "shears" away, or frees from, all error, is very like the Kathakop with regard to doctrine and style, it has, in fact, several passages in common with it. At the outset it announces itself as an almost direct revelation of Brahman himself. For Aṅgiras, who communicates it to Śaunaka, has obtained it from Bhāradvāja Satyavāha, and the latter again from Aṅgir,^a the pupil of Atharvan, to whom it was revealed by Brah-

^{17a} The list of the Atharvopaniṣads begins as a rule with the *Mundakopaniṣad*, and, according to the statements in Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa's scholium on the smaller Ath-Upaniṣads now being edited (since 1872) in the *Bibl. Indica* by Rāma-maya Tarkarata, a settled order of these Upaniṣads must still have been in existence in the time of Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa, since he denotes the individual Upaniṣads as, e.g., the seventh, the eighth, &c. reckoning from the *Mundaka*. This order is occasionally ascribed by him to the Śaunaka school. Compare as to this the remarks of Colebrooke, *Misc. Ess.*, I. 93, according to which the first fifteen Upaniṣads only would belong to the Śaunakiya, and the

following Up. to other Śākhya. But Nārāyaṇa, with whom, as regards the order of the first twenty-eight names, Colebrooke agrees in the main (from this point their statements differ), also quotes the *Saunakagrāntasthāna* for the Brahmanvindu No. 18, and the *Śikha Saunakavartu* for the *Atropaniṣad* No. 28 as authority for these numbers, or places of the two Upaniṣads. The Gopālakṣaṇi, however, is marked by him as the forty-sixth *Atarva-Paiṇṇa*, and the *Vāśudavopaniṣad* as the forty-ninth *kāṇḍagrāntasthāna*, see Rājendra Lal Mitra, *Notes of Sanskrit MSS.* I. 18 (1870).

^a Aṅgir is a name which occurs nowhere else.

man himself. Shortly afterwards, Vedic literature is opposed, as the inferior science, to speculation. The former is stated to consist of the four Vedas, and of the six Vedāṅgas, which are singly enumerated. Some manuscripts here insert mention of the *uśhāsa-purāṇa-nyāya-mīmāṃsā-dharmaśāstrāni*, but this is evidently a later addition. Such additions are also found in other passages of this Upanishad in the manuscripts. This enumeration (here occurring for the first time) of the different Vedāṅgas is of itself sufficient to show that at that time the whole material of the Vedas had been systematically digested, and that out of it a new literature had arisen, which no longer belongs to the Vedic, but to the following period. We may further conclude from the mention of the Treta in the course of the work that the Yuga-system also had already attained its final form. On the other hand, we here find the words *kālī* (the dark one) and *karālī* (the terrible one) still reckoned among the seven tongues of fire, whereas in the time of the dramatic poet Bhavabhūti (eighth century A.D.) they are names of Durgā—the wife of Śiva, developed out of Agni (and Rudra)—who under these names was the object of a bloody sacrificial worship. Since evidently a considerable time is required for the transition from the former meaning to the latter, the Mundakop must be separated by a very wide interval from the date of Bhavabhūti,—a conclusion which follows besides from the circumstance that it is on several occasions turned to account in the Vedānta-Sūtra, and that it has been commented by Śaṅkara.—The *Praśnopanishad*, in prose, seems to be borrowed from an Atharva-Brahmana, viz., that of the Pippalada-school.* It contains the instruction by Pippalada of six different teachers, amongst whom the following names are especially significant in regard to the date of the Upanishad: Kauśalya, Aśvalayana, Vaidarbhi, Bhargava, and Kabandhin, Katyayana. In the course of

* In the colophons, at least, it is once so described, by Śaṅkara, too, at the beginning of his commentary, it is called *brāhmana*, although this proves but little, since with him all the Upanishads he comments pass a *śruti* and *brāhmana*.—The name

Pippalāda is probably to be traced to the conception found in the first verse of the Mundaka III. 1 (taken from Rik mand. 1. 164. 20) (†). The same verse recurs in the Svetiśvā-tarepanishad IV. 6 and in his re-
32

the work Hiranyanábha, a prince of the Kosalas, is also mentioned,—the same doubtless who is specially extolled in the Puranas. As in the Mundakopani, so here also some interpolated words are found which betray themselves as such by the fact that they are passed over by Śamkara in his commentary. They refer to Atharvan himself, and to the half *mātrā* (mora), to which the word *om*, here appearing in its full glory, is entitled in addition to its three moras (*a, u, m*), and are evidently a later addition by some one who did not like to miss the mention of these two subjects in an Atharvopaniṣad, as in these they otherwise invariably occur. Both Mundaka and Prāśna have been several times edited and translated see *I St.* i. 280, ff. 439 ff., again recently by Dr. Roer in vol. vii. of the *Bibliotheca Indica* together with Śamkara's commentary¹⁷³—The name of Pippalāda is borne by another Upaniṣad, the *Garbha-Upaniṣad* (23), which I add here for this reason, although in other respects this is not quite its proper place. Its contents differ from those of all the other Upaniṣads, and relate to the human body, to its formation as embryo and the various parts of which it is composed, and the number and weight of these. The whole is a commentary on a *tri-śṭubh* strophe prefixed to it, the words of which are passed in review singly and further remarks then subjoined. The mention of the names of the seven musical notes of the present day, as well as of the weights now in use (which are found besides in Varaha Mihira), brings us to a tolerably modern date, so also the use of Devadatta in the sense of *Carus*. A few passages in which, among other things, mention is made, for instance, of Narayana as Supreme Lord, and of the Sāṃkhya and Yoga as the means of attaining knowledge of him, reappear in the fourteenth book—a supplementary one—of Yāska's *Nirukṭi*. Whether Śamkara expounded this Upaniṣad is as yet uncertain. It is translated in *Ind Stud.* ii. 65-71¹⁷⁴—In the *Brahmopaniṣad* also (24), Pippalāda appears, here with the title *bhagavān Aṅgīrās*, he is thus identified with the latter, as the authority for the particular

¹⁷³ Roer's translation is published in vol. xv. of the *Bibl. Indica* (1853)

¹⁷⁴ Edited with Nārāyaṇa's commentary in the *Bibliotheca Indica*,

1872, in his introduction described as *pañcakhanda 'śisṃta* (read *'mīṣ*) *Mundak Pippalāda Upaniṣad* *tathā*,

doctrine here taught which he imparts to Śaunaka (*mahā-śāla*), exactly as is the case in the Mundakopaniṣad. There is, for the rest, a considerable difference between this Upaniṣad¹⁷ and the Mundaka and Praśna, it belongs more to the Yoga-Upaniṣads properly so called. It consists of two sections the first, which is in prose, treats, in the first place, of the majesty of Ātman, and later on, in its last portion, it alleges Brahman, Vishnu, Rudra, and Akshara to be the four *pādas* (feet) of the *nirāṇam brahma*, the first eleven of the nineteen verses of the second section discuss the subject of the Yogin being allowed to lay aside his *yaṅnopavita*, or sacred thread, as he stands in the most intimate relation to the *sūtra*, or mundane thread, the whole therefore amounts to a mere play upon words. The last eight verses are borrowed from the Svetaśvatīropaniṣad, Mundakopaniṣad, and similar Upaniṣads, and again describe the majesty of the One—The *Māndūkyopaniṣad* (25–28) is reckoned as consisting of four Upaniṣads, but only the prose portion of the first of these, which treats of the three and a half *mātrās* of the word *om*, is to be looked upon as the real *Māndūkyopaniṣad*, all the rest is the work of Gaudapada,* whose pupil Govinda was the teacher of Saṃkara, it dates therefore from about the seventh century A.D. Similarly, there are two works by Saṃkara himself specified among the Upaniṣads, viz, the *Aṭavayrasūcī* (29), in prose, and the *Tripurī* (30), likewise in prose, both composed in a Vedānta sense. The former treats at the outset of what makes a *Brāhmaṇa* a *Brāhmaṇa*, it is not *jāti* (birth), *varṇa* (colour), *pāṇḍitya* (learning), but the *Brahmavid* (he who knows Brahman) is alone a *Brāhmaṇa*† Then it passes to the different definitions of *mokṣa* (liberation),

¹⁷ Edited with Nārāyaṇa's comm. in *Bibl. Ind.* 1873, in the introduction described as *chaturākṣanda dakṣiṇī*, the two sections of the text seem to have been transposed in some of the MSS.

* As such, it has been commented on by Saṃkara under the title *āgama śāstra*. For particulars see *J. St.*, II. 100–109. [Roer has published the

entire *Māndūkyopaniṣad* together with Saṃkara's comm. in *Bibl. Ind.* vol. VIII, also a translation of sect. I in vol. XV.]

† This portion has been used by a Buddhist (Aśvaghoṣa), almost literally, against the system of castes in general, in the tract of the same title which is given by Gildemeister, *Bibl. S., Pracl. p. VI*, not, 'see also

The second class of the Atharvopamśhads, as above stated, is made up of those whose subject is Yoga, or absorption in Ātman, the stages of this absorption, and the external means of attaining it. These last chiefly consist in the giving up of all earthly connections, and in the frequent repetition of the word *om*, which plays a most prominent part, and is itself therefore the subject of deep study. Yajñavalkya is repeatedly named in the Upanishads of this class as the teacher of the doctrines they set forth,* and indeed it would seem that we ought to look upon him as one of the chief promoters of the system of religious mendicancy so intimately associated with the Yoga-doctrine. Thus, in the *Tārakopaniṣad* (36) he instructs Bharadvāja as to the saving and sin dispelling efficacy of the word *om*,¹⁵³ and similarly in the *Śākalyopaniṣad* (37)* Śākalya as to true emancipation.¹⁵⁴ The one, however, in which he stands out most prominently is the *Jābālopaniṣad* (38), in prose, which, moreover, bears the name of a school or the White Yajus, although no doubt wrongly, as it must in any case be considered as merely an imitation of the Āraṇyaka of this Veda (see *I St*, II. 72-77). Still, it must have been composed before the Badarayana-Sūtra, as several passages of it† seem to be given in the latter (unless these passages have been borrowed from a common source?). Of special importance with regard to the mode of life of the Paramahansas, or religious mendicants, are also, in addition to the Upanishad just mentioned, the *Kaṭhaśruti* (39, Colebrooke gives the name incorrectly as *Kanṭhaśruti*), in prose, and the *Arunikopaniṣad* (40), likewise in prose,‡ both are to be

¹⁵³ See *I St*, II. 46-48.

* This name seems to result as the most probable one from comparison of the variants in Anquetil.

¹⁵⁴ See *I St*, II. 170.

† They presuppose the name *Vāṇasī* for Benares. [The text of the *Jābālopaniṣad* with Nārāyaṇa's comm. appeared in *Bibl. Ind.* 1874; it is described in the introd. as *yajusht* and *elachatrādrinostānti* (the latter however is said of the *Kaṭhaśruti* also), see also Burnell, p. 61, Taylor II. 474, Rā

jendra L. M. I. 92 (Commentary by Śaṅkarānanda). There are, besides, quite a number of other Upanishads bearing the name of Jābāla, viz., *Bṛhaspatisāla*, *Mahāśāla*, *Laghuśāla*, *Bhasma*, *Rudra*, *Budrāśāla*.]

‡ Translated in *I St*, II. 176-181. [Text and Nārāyaṇa's comm. in *Bibl. Ind.* 1872, described in the introd. as *pañcharasī*. There is also a commentary upon it by Śaṅkarānanda, see Rājendra L. M. I. 92. — The *Kaṭhaśruti*, also is

regarded as supplements to the *Āraṇyaka* of the Black Yajus, as the *Jābālopniṣhad* is to that of the White Yajus. The *Bhāllavi-Upaniṣhad* (41) also belongs to this class, to judge by quotations from it, and so does the *Samvartasruti* (42), similarly the *Samnyāsopaniṣhad* (43) and the *Paramahansopaniṣhad* (44), both in prose.* The *Hansopaniṣhad* (45) I have not yet met with, but from its name it probably also belongs to this place.¹³³ The *Āśramopaniṣhad* (46), in prose, gives a classification of the four Indian orders—the *Brahmachārins*, *Gṛhasthas*, *Vānaprasthas*, and *Parivrājakas*. It is even quoted by Śaṅkara, and the names applied in it to the several classes are now obsolete. The *Śrīmaddattopaniṣhad* (47) consists of twelve *ślokas* put into the mouth of one of these religious mendicants, and uniformly concluding with the refrain *asyāc 'ham pañchamāśramam*, "I am his, i.e., brahman's, fifth Āśrama." Apart from the two Upaniṣhads already mentioned, the *Mahādūkyā* and the *Tārakā*, the investigation of the sacred word *om* is principally conducted in the *Atharvasūtra* (48), in prose (explained by Śaṅkara), in which instruction is given on this subject by Atharvan to Pippalāda, Sanatkumāra, and Aṅgiras,† further, in the *Brahmaṇḍya* (49), in thirteen *ślokas*, now and then quoted by Śaṅkara,‡ and lastly, in the *Saunaka*

edited in *Bibl. Ind.* (1873), with Nārāyaṇa's commentary, although under the name Kaṣṭha*, it is clear from Nārāyaṇa's words in his introduction *Yajurvede 1.2. Charakā dnd dāsa: 'ād kaṣṭhārayaḥ (!) | asyaṇyā opaniṣhattulāyā chaturvīṅṣad bṛta (!) vṛta* | that this mode of spelling here, as well as in Burnell's Catalogue, p. 60, is a mere mistake, and that Nārāyaṇa himself connected the Upaniṣhad with the Kaṣṭha, see also Bühler *Catalogue of MSS. from Guy*, I. 58.]

* The *Paramahansopaniṣhad* is translated in *J. St.*, II. 173-176. [Text with Nār's comm. in *Bibl. Ind.* 1874] described in the introd. as *trishṇāśā 'tharvāsikāre chaturvīṅṣatām*.—The *Samnyāsopaniṣhad*, too, a printed *Ind.*, 1872, we there find a direct reference made to four

enwādas of the Ath. & (xviii.), their text is therefore given by the editor in the scholium, and that in a double form acc. to two MSS. (pp. 131-175); see also Rājendra L. M. I. 51, Taylor, II. 469.]

† Text and Nār's comm. in *Bibl. Ind.*, 1874, described in the introd. as *asv'arvāsikāntam | dīkharava*. By Rājendralal, I. 90, a comm. by Śaṅkaraṇanda is specified, see besides Burnell, p. 65.

‡ See *J. St.* II. 55.—Here, therefore we have Pippalāda and Aṅgiras appearing side by side (see above, p. 160). [Text and Nār's comm. in *Bibl. Ind.*, 1873, described in the introd. as *asv'arvāsikāntam*.]

§ Translated in *J. St.*, II. 52. [Text and Nār's comm. in *Bibl. Ind.*, 1873.]

(50) and the *Pranava* (51). These two are found in Anquetil only.¹⁸⁶ The various stages of gradual absorption into Átman form the contents of the following Upanishads (52-59) *Hansandāda* (in prose), *Kshurikā* (24 ślokas), *Nādarindu* (20 ślokas), *Brahmarindu* (22 ślokas, also called *Amritarindu*), *Amritarindu* (38 ślokas, also called *Amritandāda*), *Dhyānarindu* (23 ślokas), *Yogasikhdā* (10 ślokas), and *Yogatattva* (15 ślokas), while the majesty of Átman himself is depicted in the *Chulidā* (60, in 21 ślokas) and *Tegorindu* (61, in 14 ślokas) * in the former direct reference is repeatedly made to the doctrine of the Atharvans. The range of ideas and the style are quite identical in all the Upanishads just enumerated. The latter frequently suffers from great obscurity, partly because there occur distinct grammatical inaccuracies, partly because the construction is often very broken and without unity. Many verses recur in several of them, many again are borrowed from the Śvetāśvataropaniṣad or Maitrāyaṇopaniṣad. Contempt for caste as well as for writing (*grantha*) is a trait which appears again and again in almost all these Upanishads, and one might therefore be inclined to regard them as directly Buddhistic, were they not entirely free from all Buddhistic dogma. This agreement is to be explained simply by the fact that Buddhism itself must be considered as having been originally only a form of the Samkhya-doctrine.

The sectarian Upanishads have been set down as forming the third class. They substitute for Átman one of the forms of Vishnu or Śiva, the earlier ones following the Yoga-doctrine most closely, whilst in those of a modern date the personal element of the respective deities comes

¹⁸⁶ See I SL, ix. 52-53 and 49-52, the *Pranavopaniṣad* is mentioned by Taylor, ii. 328.

* For the *Hansandāda* see I SL, i. 385-387, the *Kshurikā* is translated, ib. ii. 171-173, likewise *Amritarindu*, ii. 59-62, *Tegorindu*, ii. 62-64, *Dhyānarindu*, ii. 1-5; *Yogasikhdā* [so we ought to read] and *Yogatattva*, ii. 47-50, [*Amritandāda*, ii. 23-28 *Chulidā*, ii. 10-21]. All these Upanishads are now published in the *Bibliotheca Indica* with Nārā-

yana's comm. (1872-73) excepting the *Hansandāda* which, however, seems to be identical with the *Hansopaniṣad* printed *ibid*. In the Introductions to the comm. *Chulidā* is described as *pañcharām*, *Brahmarindu* as *ashtāśat*, *Saṃsāragrahantharustare*, *Dhyānarindu* as *rinid* (vinsid), *Tegorindu* as *ekavintam*, *Yogasikhdā* as *granthasandohā* (i) *dadhrasatnam* (probably meant for *dadhras* i), *Yogatattva* as *travorindā* (i). C

more and more into the foreground. A special characteristic of this class are the unmeasured promises usually held out at the close of the work to him who reads and studies it, as also the quotation and veneration of sacred formulae containing the name of the particular deity.

First, as regards the Upanishads of the Vishnu-sects,—the oldest form under which Vishnu is worshipped is *Nārāyaṇa*. We find this name for the first time in the second part of the Śatapatha-Brahmana, where, however, it is not in any way connected with Vishnu, it rather stands, as at the commencement of Manu and the Vishnu-Purana, in the sense of Brahman (mascul.) This is also the case in the Nārāyaṇīyopaniṣad of the Taittirīya Āraṇyaka, and in its Atharvan-recension as Brhannārāyaṇopaniṣad, although in the latter he is at least called Hari, and in one passage brought into direct relation to Vasudeva and Vishnu. It is in the *Mahā-Upaniṣad* (62),—a prose tract, which* in its first part contains the emanation of the universe from Nārāyaṇa, and in its second a paraphrase of the principal passage of the Nārāyaṇīyopaniṣad,—that Nārāyaṇa first distinctly appears as the representative of Vishnu, since Śūlapāni (Śiva) and Brahman proceed from him, and Vishnu is not mentioned at all. In the *Nārāyaṇopaniṣad* (64, in prose),¹²⁷ on the contrary, Vishnu also emanates from him, exactly as in the Nārāyaṇa section† of the twelfth book of the *Mahā-Bhārata* (a book which in other respects also is of special significance in relation to the Sāṃkhya- and Yoga-doctrines). The sacred formula here taught is *om namo Nārāyaṇa*, &c. There exists of this Upaniṣad another, probably a later, recension which forms part of the Atharvaśiras to be mentioned hereafter, and in which Devakīputra Madhusūdana is mentioned as particularly *brahmanya*, pious, as is also the case in the *Ātmaprabodha-Upaniṣad* (65), which like-

* Translated in *I. St.*, li. 5-8 (see also Taylor, li. 463, Rājendra L. M. l. 25), besides it there must have existed another *Mahā-Upan.* (63) which is cited by the adherents of the Mithava sect as a warrant for their belief in a personal soul of the universe, distinct from the soul of man.

¹²⁷ See also Rājendra L. M. l. 12, 91 (comm. by Saṃkardhārda).

† At the time of the (last?) arrangement of the present text of the *Mahā-Bhārata*, Nārāyaṇa worship must have been particularly flourishing.

wise celebrates Narayana as the Supreme Lord,¹³³ see I St., ii 8, 9. He (Narayana) is named, besides, in the same quality in the Garbhopaniṣad (in a passage recurring in the Nirukti, xiv) and in the Śakalyopaniṣad.

The second form under which we find Vishnu worshipped is *Nṛsiṃha*. The earliest mention of him hitherto known appears in the Tañt. Ār., x i 8 (in the Narayanyop), under the name of *Narasimha*, and with the epithets *vajranakha* and *vīśhnadānshīra*. The only Upaniṣad in which he is worshipped is the *Nṛsiṃhatāpanyopaniṣad* (in prose). It is relatively of considerable extent, and is also counted as six separate Upaniṣads (66-71), as it consists of two parts,* the first of which is in turn subdivided into five distinct Upaniṣads. The first part treats of the Anuṣṭubh-formula † sacred to *Nṛsiṃha*, the *mantrārāja nārasimha ānuṣṭubha*, with which the most wondrous tricks are played, wherein we have to recognise the first beginnings of the later Malamanttras with their Tantra-ceremonial. A great portion of the Mandūkyopaniṣad is incorporated into it, and the existence also of the *Ātmaśākhā* is presupposed, as it is directly quoted. The contents of the second part are of a more speculative character; but in respect of mystical trifling it does not yield to the first part. In both, the triad—Brahman, Vishnu, and Śiva—is repeatedly mentioned. As regards language, the expression *buddha* for the supreme Ātman, which occurs (along with *nitya*, *buddha satya*, *mukta*, &c.) in the second part, is of peculiar interest, and the expression is still retained in Gaudapada and Śaṅkara, originally it belongs evidently to the Sāṃkhya school (see above, pp 27, 129).

This Upaniṣad has been interpreted by Gaudapada and Śaṅkara, and in addition to much that is quite modern, it presents a great deal that is ancient. It probably dates from about the fourth century A.D., as at that

¹³³ See also Pāṇendra L. 31, iii 36, Taylor ii 328.

* The above mentioned lists of Upaniṣads in the Chambers collection admit a *Madhyatāpani* also [see my Catalogue, p 95].

† It runs *ugram tīram mahānā*

*num jvalantam śreetaṃmukham |
nṛsiṃham bhāṣāraṃ bhādrāṃ
mṛtyumṛtyuṃ namāmy aham, ||* "I
worship the terrible, powerful,
mighty Vishnu, the flaming the om-
nipotent, *Nṛsiṃha*, the dread, the
holy one, the death of death."

time the Nṛsiṃha worship flourished on the western coast of India, while otherwise we find no traces of it.¹²⁷

The *Rāmatāpaniṣad* (72, 73), in which Rama is worshipped as the Supreme God, shows a great resemblance to the Nṛsiṃhatāpaniṣop, especially in its second part. This second part, which is in prose, is, properly speaking, nothing but a collection of pieces from the Tārakopaniṣad, Māndūkyopaniṣad, Jabalopaniṣad, and Nṛsiṃhopaniṣad, naturally with the necessary alterations. Yājñavalkya here appears as the proclaimer of the divine glory of Rama. A London MS. adds at the close a long passage which is unknown to the commentator Anandarāya (a native of the town Kuṇḍina). The crowning touch of the sectarian element in this Upaniṣad is found in the circumstance that Rāma is implored by Śiva (Śaṅkara) himself to spare those a second birth who die in Manikarnikā or in the Ganga generally, the two principal seats of the Śiva worship. The first part, in ninety-five *śloka*s contains at the beginning a short sketch of Rāma's life, which bears a great similarity to that at the beginning of the *Adhyatmaramayana* (in the *Brahmāṇḍa-Purāṇa*). The Mantrīriya is next taught by the help of a mystical alphabet, specially invented for the purpose.* This Upaniṣad evidently belongs to the school of Rāmānuja, possibly to Rāmānuja himself, consequently its earliest date would be the eleventh century A.D.¹²⁸

Under the names Vishnu, Purushottama, and Vāsudeva Vishnu is mentioned as the supreme Ātman in several

¹²⁷ See text and translation of this Upaniṣad in *J. S.* ix 53-173; and especially on the chronological question pp. 62, 63. In the *BZL Indica* also, this Upaniṣad has been published by Rāmaswāya Tarkaratna (1870-71) with Śaṅkara's commentary (it is however, doubtful whether the commentary on the second part belongs to Śaṅkara), together with the small (*Advaitya*) *śloka*s acknowledged and Vāidyāya's comment on it.

* The *Nāṛa* *śloka*s and a *Vārīḥa* *Mantra* are also mentioned.

¹²⁸ See text and translation in my new *Die Rāma Tāpaniṣa Upani*

śad (1864), text and *Mātrā* a comment in *BZL Indica* (1873); in the introductions to the two sections are called *paśchātātāpāna* and *śloka* *śrīḥa* respectively. The time of composition is probably even later than above supposed. In the first place, according to Vāidyāya's comments in his *Samyuktārāyaṇa* (see Anstreich, *Catalogue* 17 253, 257), Rāmānuja flourished as late as the twelfth century (*śloka* 10, 7 = A.D. 1177). But further the *Rāmāṇḍa* and *displays* still closer relations to *śaṅkara*, who is supposed to have lived towards the end of the twelfth century, see my *Samy.* p. 35.

Upanishads,* Krishna Devakīputra appears likewise in some of them (the Ātmaprabodha and Narayana), not, however, as supreme Ātman, but merely, as in the Chhandogya, as a particularly pious sage. It is in the *Gopāla'āpanīyopanishad* (74, 75) that we first find him elevated to divine dignity. Of this Upanishad, the second part at least, in prose, is known to me†. It treats first of the *gopīs* of Mathura and Vraja, then it passes to the identification of Mathura with Brahmapura, &c., and it belongs without doubt to a very modern period, as it exhibits hardly any points of contact with other Upanishads in regard to contents and language.¹²¹ The *Gopīchandanopanishad* (76) also probably belongs to this place.¹²² I know it only by name.

At the head of the Upanishads belonging to the Śiva-sects stands, according to the use that has been made of it, the *Satarudriya*. I have already remarked, however, that this is nothing but an abuse. In its germs the worship of Śiva may be traced even in the later portions of the Yajus.‡ He appears very prominently as Mahadeva in a portion of the Narayaniyopanishad, and here he is already associated with his spouse. The Śvetāśvataropanishad also pays homage to him. Among the Atharvopanishads the most ancient in this regard is the *Kaivalyopanishad* (77), a mixture of prose and śloka, in which *bhagavān mahādeva* himself instructs Āśvalayana concerning his own majesty, in a similar way he acts as his own herald§ in the *Atharvashiras* (78) in prose. The latter

* And also, in particular, under the name Vāsudeva, in the writings ascribed to Saṅkara.

† The lists in the Chambers collection on specify a *Gopālatāpini*, *Madhya-tāpini*, *Uttarātāpini*, and *Bṛhaduttarātāpini*.

¹²¹ The text of this Upanishad with Viśvesvara's commentary, is printed in the *Bell Indica* (1870), edited by Harachandra Vidyābhāṣa and Viśvanāthācharya. Occasionally extracts are added from the commentaries by Nārāyaṇa and Jīvaśvāmīn. According to Rājendral, i 18 its first section is described in Nārāyaṇa's introduction

as *śaśchaitrāntarāṇī cha purnā cha 'tharvopāyale*—See an analysis of the second section in Taylor, ii 472.

¹²² So also according to Rājendral, i 20 (comment by Nār), 60, it is especially "a treatise on the merits of putting on sectarian marks on the forehead with an ochrous earth called *gopīchandana*."

‡ As in the Atharva Samhitā and in the Sāṅkhya Brāhmana (see pp 45 110).

§ Like Krishna in the Bhāgavad gītā. The *Kaivalyopanishad* is translated I & C, ii 9-14, on *Atharvashiras* see *ibid*, i pp 382 385 [Text of, and two commentaries on,

Upaishad has been expounded by Śaṅkara. Under the same title, "head of Atharvan,"—a name that is also borne by Brahman himself although in a different relation—there exists a second Upanishad, itself a conglomeration of five different Upanishads referring to the five principal deities, Gaṇapati (79), Nārāyaṇa, Rudra, Sūrya (80), and Devī (81)* Its Nārāyaṇa-portion is a later recension of the Nārāyaṇopaniṣad (64, see above, p. 166), and the Rudra-portion follows the first chapter of the Atharvashiras proper. All five have been translated by Vans Kennedy in the *Mahā-Bharata* (i. 2882), and the Code of Viṣṇu where the Atharvashiras is mentioned along with the *Bṛāhmandāni sāmāni*, and in Viṣṇu also, where it appears beside the *Sātarudriya* (as the principal means of expiation), the reference probably is to the Upanishad explained by Śaṅkara†—The *Rudrop* and *Atharvaniya-Rudrop* are known to me only through the Catalogue of the India Office Library. Possibly they are identical with those already named, I therefore exclude them from my list. The *Mrutyulaṅgha-nopaniṣad* (82)† is quite modern, and with it is wor-

the *Kaivalyopaniṣad* printed in *Bibl. Ind.*, 1874, the first commentary is that of Nārāyaṇa, the second is described by the editor as that of Śaṅkara, in the colophon as that of Śaṅkaraśaṅkara, it follows, however, from Rājendra Lāla Mitra's Catalogue, i. 32, that it is different from the commentary written by the latter, and according to the same authority is 247. It is identical rather with that of Viśvākrpā. In Nārāyaṇa's introduction this Upanishad is described exactly like the *Jāṭhī* as *ekāśatrasūtrī* and. The *Sūtra* or *Atharvashiras* Upanishad is likewise printed in *Bibl. Ind.* (1872) with Nārāyaṇa's comment, which describes it as *rudraśrīyāśatrasūtrī*. See also Rājendra i. 32 (comm. by Śaṅkaraśaṅkara 48).

* See *J. S. M.*, 53, and Vans Kennedy's *Researches into the Nature and History of Hindoo and Ancient Mythology* p. 412, &c. [Taylor, ii. 467-471. By Rājendra, i. 61, a *Gaṇa-*

patyopaniṣad printed in *Bibl. Ind.*, 1874, the first commentary is that of Nārāyaṇa, the second is described by the editor as that of Śaṅkara, in the colophon as that of Śaṅkaraśaṅkara, it follows, however, from Rājendra Lāla Mitra's Catalogue, i. 32, that it is different from the commentary written by the latter, and according to the same authority is 247. It is identical rather with that of Viśvākrpā. In Nārāyaṇa's introduction this Upanishad is described exactly like the *Jāṭhī* as *ekāśatrasūtrī* and. The *Sūtra* or *Atharvashiras* Upanishad is likewise printed in *Bibl. Ind.* (1872) with Nārāyaṇa's comment, which describes it as *rudraśrīyāśatrasūtrī*. See also Rājendra i. 32 (comm. by Śaṅkaraśaṅkara 48).

† So we have probably to understand *Arquetis Annet Lantre*, since he has also another form, *Arquetis Lantre*, instead of, *Arquetis Lantre* we ought to read *Arquetis Lantre*. (See now *J. S. M.*, ix. 21-23) according to this it is doubtful whether the name ought not to be written *Mrutyulaṅgha*. An Upanishad named *Mrutyulaṅgha* is mentioned by Bühler *Cat. of MSS. from Gaj.*, i. 120. A *Mrutyulaṅgha*, however, appears as 82d Upanishad in the Catalogue of 1861 *Public Library*. Finally, Bernier in publishing the text in the *Indus Anthology* in 1864, gives the form *Mrutyulaṅgha*.]

thly associated the *Kālāgnirudropanishad* (83),¹⁹³ in prose, of which there are no less than three different recensions, one of which belongs to the Nandikeśvara-Upapurāṇa. The *Tripuropanishad* (84) also appears from its name—otherwise it is unknown to me—to belong to this division,¹⁹⁴ it has been interpreted by Bhatta Bhaskara Miśra. The *Skandopaniṣad* (85), in fifteen ślokaś, is also Siva-iti.¹⁹⁵ (likewise the *Amṛitanādoṣanishad*) The adoration of Siva's spouse, his Śakti,—the origin of which may be traced back to the Kenopaniṣad and the Narayāṇīyopaniṣad,—is the subject of the *Sundarīdāṇīyopaniṣad* (known to me by name only), in five parts (86–90), as well as of the *Devī-Upanishad* (79), which has already been mentioned. The *Kaulopaniṣad* (91), in prose, also belongs to a Sakta sectary.*

Lastly, a few Upanishads (92–95) have to be mentioned, which are known to me only by their names, names which do not enable us to draw any conclusion as to their contents, viz., the *Pindopaniṣad*, *Nilorkhopaniṣad* (Colebrooke has *Nilarudra*), *Pañgalopaniṣad* and *Darśanopaniṣad*.¹⁹⁶ The *Garudopaniṣad* (96), of which I know two totally different texts, celebrates the serpent-destroyer Garuḍa,† and is not without some antiquarian interest

¹⁹³ It treats specially of the tri-pundratīkṣa, see Taylor, i 461, Rājendrar, i 59, Burnell, p 61.

¹⁹⁴ See on it Taylor, ii 470, Burnell p. 62.

¹⁹⁵ Identifies Siva with Vishnu, and teaches the doctrines of the Advaita school. Taylor, ii 467, Burnell, p 65.

* In the *Iśojvinda* (61) also brahman is described as *dhara*, *śam bhara* *śikṣa*.

¹⁹⁶ The *Pindop* and the *Nilarudrop*—this is its proper name—are now printed in *Bibl Ind.* (1873), with Nārāyaṇa's comment. the former, which treats of the *pūndas* to the *pretas* is described by Nārāyaṇa as

saptaviṃśatīpurāṇī, the latter as *śhodāśī*. It is addressed to Rudra (see also Rājendra! i 51) and consists only of verses, which closely follow those contained in Vāj S xvi. On the *Pañgalop* and *Darśanop*, see Taylor, ii 468–471.

† As is done in the *Nārāyaṇīyopaniṣad* also and more especially in the *Suparṇadhya*, which is considered to belong to the Rik [edited by Ekmār Grube 1875, see also *I. St.* xiv 1, ff.—The *Garudopaniṣad* is now printed in *Bibl Ind.* (1874), with Nārāyaṇa's commentary in the introduction it is described as *chatuschatvarīṃśattamī*.]

SECOND PERIOD.

SANSKRIT LITERATURE.

SECOND PERIOD

SANSKRIT LITERATURE.



HAVING thus followed the first period of Indian literature, in its several divisions, down to its close, we now turn to its second period, the so-called Sanskrit literature. Here, however, as our time is limited, we cannot enter so much into detail as we have hitherto done, and we must therefore content ourselves with a general survey. In the case of the Vedic literature, details were especially essential both because no full account of it had yet been given, and because the various works still lie, for the most part, shut up in the manuscripts, whereas the Sanskrit literature has already been repeatedly handled, partially at least, and the principal works belonging to it are generally accessible.

Our first task, naturally, is to fix the distinction between the second period and the first. This is, in part one of age, in part, one of subject-matter. The former distinction is marked by the language and by direct data, the latter by the nature of the subject-matter itself, as well as by the method of treating it.

As regards the language, in the first place, in so far as it grounds a distinction in point of age between the two periods of Indian literature, its special characteristics in the second period, although apparently slight, are yet in reality, so significant that it appropriately furnishes the name for the period, whereas the earlier one receives its designation from the works composing it.

Among the various dialects of the different Indo-Aryan tribes, a greater unity had in the course of time been established after their immigration into India, as the natural result of their intermingling in their new homes, and of

their combination into larger communities. The grammatical * study, moreover, which by degrees became necessary for the interpretation of the ancient texts, and which grew up in connection therewith, had had the effect of substantially fixing the usage, so that a generally recognised language, known as the *Śākhya*, had arisen, that, namely, in which the *Brāhmanas* and *Sūtras* are composed.† Now the greater the advance made by the study of grammar, the more stringent and precise its precepts and rules became, and all the more difficult it was for those who did not occupy themselves specially therewith to keep in constant accord with grammatical accuracy. The more the language of the grammatically educated gained on the one hand in purity, and in being purged of everything not strictly regular, the more foreign did it become on the other hand to the usage of the majority of the people, who were without grammatical training. In this way a refined language gradually disconnected itself from the vernacular, as more and more the exclusive property of the higher classes of the people, ‡ the estrange-

* Respecting the use of the verb *vyākṛā* in a grammatical signification, Śāyana in his introduction to the *Rik* (p. 35. 23 ed. Müller) adduces a legend from a *Brāhmaṇa*, which represents Indra as the oldest grammarian (See Lassen, *J. AA.*, ii. 475) (The legend is taken from the *TB.* vi. 4. 7. 3. All that is there stated, indeed, is that *vyākṛā* was *vyākṛā* by Indra; manifestly, however, the later myths which do actually set up Indra as the oldest grammarian connect themselves with this passage.)

† *Śākhya-sūtra* in *Kātyāyana*, *Śrauta-Sūtra*, I. 8. 17, is expressly interpreted as *brāhmaṇa-sūtra*, see *Edy. Samh. Specimens*, ii. 196, 197 [*J. St.*, x. 425-427, 437] Yāska repeatedly opposes *Śākhya* and *aranyaka* (i.e., "in the Veda reading," in the text of the hymns) to each other similarly, the *Prīti Śākhya Sūtra* employ the words *Śākhya* and *Śākhya* as opposed to *śākhya* and *śākhya*, i.e., *śākhya* (see above pp. 57, 103 141) The way in

which the word *Śākhya* is used in the *Śākhya Sūtra* of *Śākhya*, namely, in contradistinction to *śākhya*, shows that its meaning had already by this time become essentially modified, and become restricted, precisely as it is in *Pāṇini* to the extra Vedic, so to say, profane literature. (The *Śākhya-Sūtra* gives in stead of *Śākhya*, in the corresponding passage *śākhya* *śākhya* *śākhya*.) [This is incorrect; rather in the passage in question, these words follow the word *Śākhya*, see the note on this point at p. 56] In the same way, in the *Nir.* xiv. 9. *mantra*, *śākhya*, *śākhya*, and the *vyākṛā* (i.e., *Śākhya*) are opposed to each other (and also *śākhya*, *śākhya*, and the *vyākṛā*).

‡ Ought the passage cited in *Nir.* xiv. 9 from a *śākhya* [*J. St.* xiv. 5] to the effect that the *śākhya* spoke both tongue that of the gods as well as that of men, to be taken in this connection? or has this reference merely to a conception resembling the *Homeric* one?

ment between the two growing more and more marked, as the popular dialect in its turn underwent further development. This took place mainly under the influence of those aboriginal inhabitants who had been received into the Brahmanic community, who, it is true, little by little exchanged their own language for that of their conquerors, but not without importing into the latter a large number of new words and of phonetic changes, and, in particular, very materially modifying the pronunciation. This last was all the more necessary, as the numerous accumulations of consonants in the Aryan *bhāshā* presented exceeding difficulties to the natives, and it was all the easier, as there had evidently prevailed within the language itself from an early period a tendency to clear away these troublesome encumbrances of speech,—a tendency to which, indeed, the study of grammar imposed a limit, so far as the educated portion of the Aryans was concerned, but which certainly maintained itself, and by the very nature of the case continued to spread amongst the people at large. This tendency was naturally furthered by the native inhabitants, particularly as they acquired the language not from those who were conversant with grammar, but from intercourse and association with the general body of the people. In this way there gradually arose new vernaculars, proceeding directly from the common *bhāshā*,* and distinguished from it mainly by the assimilation of consonants, and by

* And therefore specially so called down even to modern times, where, as the grammatically refined *bhāshā* afterwards lost this title, and substituted for it the name *Samākṛta-bhāshā*, 'the cultivated speech.' The name *Prākṛta-bhāshā*, which was at the same time applied to the popular dialects, is derived from the word *prakṛta*, 'nature,' 'origin,' and probably describes these as the 'natural,' 'original' continuations of the ancient *bhāshā* or does *prakṛta* here signify 'having a *prakṛta* or origin,' i.e., 'derived from [Out of the signification 'original,' lying at the root of (*prakṛta* *bhāshā*) 'unmodified,' arose that of 'normal' then that of 'ordinary,' 'common,' 'vulgar,' and lastly that of 'pro-

ceeding in common from.' The term directly opposed to it is not *samākṛta*, but *vākṛta*, see, e.g., Ath. Parī. 49. 1, "vācān pūrvam vyākṛtān syāmaḥ prakṛta ye cā vākṛtāḥ." The earliest instances as yet known of the name *Samākṛta* as a designation of the language occur in the *Mṛcchakatikā* (p. 44. 2, ed. Stenzler), and in *Varāha Mihira's Bṛhat Saṃhitā*, 8, 3. The following passages also of the *Rāmāyaṇa* are doubtless to be understood in this sense, viz., v 18. 19. 29. 17. 34 (32. 3), vi. 104. 2. Pāṇini is familiar with the word *Samākṛta*, but does not use it in this sense, though the *Pāṇinīyā-Sikshā* does so employ it (v 3), in contradistinction to *vākṛta*.

the curtailment or loss of terminations. Not unfrequently, however, they present older forms of these than are found in the written language, partly because the latter has rigorously eliminated all forms in any way irregular or obsolete, but partly also, no doubt, from the circumstance that grammar was cultivated principally in the north or north-west of India, and consequently adapted itself specially to the usage there prevailing. And in some respects (e.g. in the instr plur of words in *a*)¹²⁷ this usage may have attained a more developed phase than appears to have been the case in India Proper,* since the language was not there hampered in its independent growth by any external influence, whereas the Aryans who had passed into India maintained their speech upon the same internal level on which it stood at the time of the immigration,† how-

¹²⁷ This example is not quite pertinent, as the instr plur in *-ā* is of very ancient date being reflected not only in Zend, but also in Slavonic and Lithuanian; see Dopp, *Vergl. Gram.*, I 156³ (159²).

* The difference in usage between the Eastern and Western forms of speech is once touched upon in the *Bṛhadhara* of the White Yajur, where it is said that the Vāhika style Agni *Bhāsa*, while the Prāchya, on the contrary, call him *Sarva*. Yāska (II 2) opposes the Kambojas (the Persa Aryans) to the Aryas (the Indo-Aryans) stating that the latter, for instance, possess derivatives only of the root *śu*, whereas the Kambojas possess it also as a verb. (Grammarians of the Kambojas are hardly to be thought of here, as Roth, *Zur Lit.*, p. 67, supposes.) Yāska further opposes the Prāchya and the Udi byas, and the same is done by Pāṇini. According to the *Bṛhadhara*, the Udi byas were most conversant with grammar [see *J. St.*, I 152, II 307 310, XIII 353, cf. Barnell's identification of the Kambojas here, and in the other earlier passages where they are mentioned with Cambal in *Farther India* see his *Elements of South Indian Palaeogeography* pp. 31, 3* 91 is clearly a mistake. For the time of the fall

Abhidhānappadīpikā (v Childers, *Pali Dict.*) this identification may perhaps be correct † but the older Sanskrit texts, and even the inscriptions of Piyadasi (e.g., most distinctly the facsimile of the Kāśī inscription in Cunningham's *Archaeological Survey* I 247, pl. xii, line 7), introduce the Kambojas in connection with the Yavanas; and this of itself determines that the two belonged geographically to the same region in the north west of India, see *J. St.*, II 321. In addition to this we have the name *Kamboja* = *Kamboja* and therewith all the various references to this latter name, which point to a very wide ramification of it throughout India; see *J. St.*, II 473. To further India the name *Kamboja* evidently found its way only in later times, like the names *Ayodhya*, *Jodhpur*, *prastha*, *Iravati*, *Champā*; though it certainly remains strange that this too should have fallen precisely to it. Perhaps errors connected with Buddhism may have helped to bring this about. See on this point the *Senar Literature* Aug 1875, p. 218; *Jadav* 1st query 10 244.]

† Much as the Germans did who in the middle ages emigrated to Transylvania.

ever considerable were the external modifications which it underwent

The second period of Indian literature, then, commences with the epoch when the separation of the language of the educated classe,—of the written language—from the popular dialects was an accomplished fact. It is in the former alone that the literature is presented to us. Not till after the lapse of time did the vernaculars also in their turn produce literatures of their own,—in the first instance under the influence of the Buddhist religion, which addressed itself to the people as such, and whose scriptures and records, therefore, were originally, as for the most part they still are, composed in the popular idiom. The epoch in question cannot at present be precisely determined, yet we may with reasonable certainty infer the existence of the written language also, at a time when we are in a position to point to the existence of popular dialects, and with respect to these we possess historical evidence of a rare order, in those rock-inscriptions, of identical purport, which have been discovered at Girnār in the Gujarat peninsula, at Dhāuli in Orissa, and at Kapur di Giri¹³³ in Kabul. J Prinsep, who was the first to decipher them and Lassen, refer them to the time of the Buddhist king Aśoka, who reigned from B C 259, but, according to the most recent investigations on the subject—by Wilson, in the "Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society," xii, 1850 (p 95 of the separate impression)—they were engraved "at some period subsequent to B C 205" * and are are still, therefore, of uncertain date. However this question may be settled, it in any case results with tolerable certainty

¹³³ This name ought probably to be written *Kapardigiri*. See my paper on the *Sātrūṃjaya Māhātmya*, p. 118. In these inscriptions, moreover, we have a text, similar in purport, presented to us in three distinct dialects. See further on this subject Burnouff's admirable discussion of these inscriptions in his *Lotus de la bonne Loi*, p. 632, ff. (1852), I St., n. 467 ff. (1855), and Kern *De Ge denkschriften van Aśoka den Buddhist* (1873, particularly p. 32 ff., 45 ff.)

* And that not much later, as is vouched for by the names of the Greek kings therein mentioned—Alexander, Antigonos, Magas, Ptolemy, Antiochus. These cannot, it is true, be regarded as contemporaneous with the inscriptions, but their notoriety in India can hardly have been of such long duration that the inscriptions can have been composed long after their time. See Wilson, l c.

that these popular dialects were in existence in the third century B.C. But this is by no means to be set down as the limit for the commencement of their growth, on the contrary, the form in which they are presented to us sufficiently shows that a very considerable period must have elapsed since their separation from the ancient *śākhā*. This separation must therefore have taken place comparatively early, and indeed we find allusions to these vernaculars here and there in the Brāhmanas themselves.*

The direct data, attesting the posteriority of the second period of Indian literature, consist in these facts: first, that its opening phases everywhere presuppose the Vedic period as entirely closed; next, that its oldest portions are regularly based upon the Vedic literature, and, lastly, that the relations of life have now all arrived at a stage of development of which, in the first period, we can only trace the germs and beginning. Thus, in particular, divine worship is now centred on a triad of divinities, Brahman, Vishnu, and Śiva, the two latter of whom, again, in course of time, have the supremacy severally allotted to them under various forms, according to the different sects that grew up for this purpose. It is by no means implied that individual portions of the earlier period may not run on into the later, on the contrary, I have frequently endeavoured in the preceding pages to show that such is the case. For the rest, the connection between the two periods is on the whole, somewhat loose. It is closest as regards those branches of literature which had already attained a definite stage of progress in the first period, and which merely continued to develop further in the second,—Grammar, namely, and Philosophy. In regard to those branches, on the contrary, which are a more independent

* Thus in the second part of the *Āitareya Brāhmaṇa* the *śākhā* are called (1) of the western *Sāras*, are mentioned as "*śākhā* of the *śākhā*," and in the *Pāṇinīyā* *śākhā*, the *śākhā* are found fault with for their debased language. The *śākhā* are also censured in the *Sāras* *śākhā* (1. 2. 1. 24), where, at the same time, the *śākhā*

are warned against a "bad form of speech," "*śākhā* *śākhā* as *śākhā*."—I may remark here in passing that *śākhā* is the *śākhā* of the *śākhā*, in *śākhā* introduction p. 36. 21, *śākhā* writes *śākhā* as one word (*śākhā* for *śākhā*), while *śākhā* is corrupt in the battle-*śākhā* (*śākhā* is *śākhā*) according to the *śākhā* *śākhā*, it even took the form *śākhā*.

growth of the second period, the difficulty of connecting them with the earlier age is very great. We have here a distinct gap which it is altogether impossible to fill up. The reason of this lies simply in the fact, that owing to the difficulty of preserving literary works, the fortunate successor almost always wholly supplanted the predecessor it surpassed—the latter thus became superfluous, and was consequently put aside, no longer committed to memory, no longer copied. In all these branches therefore—unless some other influence has supervened—we are in possession only of those master-works in which each attained its culminating point, and which in later times served as the classical models upon which the modern literature was formed, itself more or less destitute of native productive energy. This fact has been already adduced as having proved equally fatal in the case of the more ancient Bráhma literature, &c., there, much to the same extent as here, it exercised its lamentable, though natural influence. In the Vedic literature also, that is to say, in its Śakhas, we find the best analogy for another kindred point, namely, that some of the principal works of this period are extant in several—generally two—recensions. But along with this a further circumstance has to be noted, which, in consequence of the great care expended upon the sacred literature, has comparatively slight application to it, namely, that the mutual relation of the manuscripts is of itself such as to render any certain restoration of an original text for the most part hopeless. It is only in cases where ancient commentaries exist that the text is in some degree certain, for the time at least to which these commentaries belong. This is evidently owing to the fact that these works were originally preserved by oral tradition, their consignment to writing only took place later, and possibly in different localities at the same time, so that discrepancies of all sorts were inevitable. But besides these variations there are many alterations and additions which are obviously of a wholly arbitrary nature, partly made intentionally, and partly due to the mistakes of transcribers. In reference to this latter point, in particular, the fact must not be lost sight of that, in consequence of the destructive influence of the climate, copies had to be renewed very frequently. As a rule, the more ancient Indian manuscripts

are only from three to four hundred years old, hardly any will be found to date more than five hundred years back.¹⁰⁰ Little or nothing, therefore, can here be effected by means of so-called diplomatic criticism. We cannot even depend upon a text as it appears in quotations, such quotations being generally made from memory,—a practice which, of course, unavoidably entails mistakes and alterations.

The distinction in point of subject-matter between the first and second periods consists mainly in the circumstance that in the former the various subjects are only handled in their details, and almost solely in their relation to the sacrifice, whereas in the latter they are discussed in their general relations. In short it is not so much a practical, as rather a scientific, a poetical, and artistic want that is here satisfied. The difference in the form under which the two periods present themselves is in keeping with this. In the former, a simple and compact prose had gradually been developed, but in the latter this form is abandoned, and a rhythmic one adopted in its stead, which is employed exclusively, even for strictly scientific exposition. The only exception to this occurs in the grammatical and philosophical Sūtras, and these again are characterised by a form of expression so condensed and technical that it can not fittingly be termed prose. Apart from this we have only fragments of prose, occurring in stories which are now and then found cited in the great epic, and further in the fable literature and in the drama, but they are uniformly interwoven with rhythmical portions. It is only in the Buddhist legends that a prose style has been retained the

¹⁰⁰ Regarding the age, manner of preparation, material and condition of text of the MSS., see Lajpala Mitra's excellent report, dated 15th February 1875, on the MSS. deposited by him in natural history down to the end of the previous year, which is appended to No. IX. of his *Notes of Sanskrit MSS.* Quite recently some Devanagari MSS. of Jaina texts, written on broad palm-leaves, have been discovered by Luther which date two centuries earlier than any previously known. A fair tale of one of these

MSS. in Luther's possession, the *Aradyaka Sūtra*, dated 4000 B.C. (A.D. 1132), is annexed to a somewhat mentioned report. "It is the oldest Sanskrit MS. that has come to my notice," Lajpala Mitra writes in a letter from 1st Oct. (17th October 1875) in which he states that in one of the *Sūtras* he has found that have lately arrived in Cambridge from Bengal. He has read the whole of the *Sūtra* and is of the opinion that further examination of it will of course be of great service to the science.

language of which, however, is a very peculiar one, and is, moreover, restricted to a definite field. In fact, as the result of this neglect, prose-writing was completely arrested in the course of its development, and declined altogether. Anything more clumsy than the prose of the later Indian romances, and of the Indian commentaries, can hardly be, and the same may be said of the prose of the inscriptions.

This point must not be left out of view, when we now proceed to speak of a classification of the Sanskrit literature into works of Poetry, works of Science and Art, and works relating to Law, Custom, and Worship. All alike appear in a poetic form, and by 'Poetry' accordingly in this classification we understand merely what is usually styled *belles-lettres*, though certainly with an important modification of this sense. For while, upon the one hand, the poetic form has been extended to all branches of the literature, upon the other, as a set-off to this, a good deal of practical prose has entered into the poetry itself, imparting to it the character of poetry 'with a purpose.' Of the epic poetry this is especially true.

It has long been customary to place the Epic Poetry at the head of Sanskrit literature, and to this custom we here conform, although its existing monuments cannot justly pretend to pass as more ancient than, for example, Pāṇini's grammar, or the law-book which bears the name of Manu. We have to divide the epic poetry into two distinct groups—the *Itihāsa-Purāṇas* and the *Kāvya*s. We have already more than once met with the name *Itihāsa-Purāṇa* in the later Brahmanas, namely, in the second part of the *Satapatha-Brahmana*, in the *Taittirīya-Āraṇyaka*, and in the *Cihandogyaopaniṣad*. We have seen that the commentators uniformly understand these expressions to apply to the legendary passages in the Brahmanas themselves, and not to separate works, and also that, from a passage in the thirteenth book of the *Satapatha-Brahmana*, it results with tolerable certainty that distinct works of this description cannot then have existed, inasmuch as the division into *pārvans*, which is usual in the extant writings of this class, is there expressly attributed to other works, and is not employed in reference to these *Itihāsa-Purāṇas* themselves. On the other hand, in the *Śarpī-vidyā* ('serpent knowledge') and the *Devajana-vidyā* ('genealogies of

the gods')—to which, in the passage in question, the distribution into *parians*, that is to say, existence in a distinct form, is expressly assigned—we have in all probability to recognise mythological accounts, which from their nature might very well be regarded as precursors of the epic. We have likewise already specified as forerunners of the epic poetry, those myths and legends which are found interspersed throughout the *Brahmanas*, here and there, too in rhythmic form,* or which lived on elsewhere in the tradition regarding the origin of the songs of the *Rik*. Indeed, a few short prose legends of this sort have been actually preserved here and there in the epic itself. The *Gāthās* also—stanzas in the *Brahmanas*, extolling individual deeds of prowess—have already been cited in the like connection—they were sung to the accompaniment of the lute, and were composed in honour either of the prince of the day or of the pious kings of old (see *I St.*, i. 187). As regards the extant epic—the *Mahā-Bhārata*—specially, we have already pointed out the mention in the *Taittiriya-Āitanyaka*, of *Vyāsa Paraśarya*¹⁰⁰ and *Vasampayana*,¹⁰⁰ who are given in the poem itself as its original authors, and we have also remarked (p. 143) that the family of the

* As, for instance, the story of *Harischandra* in the second part of the *Aitareya-Brahmana*.

¹⁰⁰ *Vyāsa Paraśarya* is likewise mentioned in the *raṇsa* of the *Sāma vidhāna Brahmana*, as the disciple of *Vishvaksena*, and preceptor of *Jaimini*, see *I St.*, iv. 377. The *Mahābhāṣya*, again, not only contains frequent allusions to the legend of the *Mahā-Bhārata*, and even metrical quotations that connect them selves with it, but it also contains the name of *Suka Vaidika*, and from this it is clear that there was then already extant a poetical version of the *Mahā-Bhārata* story, see *I St.*, xiii. 357. Among the prior births of *Buddha* is one (No. 436 in *Westergaard's Catalogus*, p. 40) bearing the name *Kaṇha-Dīpāyana*, i.e. *Kṛishna Dvaipayana*!

¹⁰⁰ *Vasampayana* appears elsewhere frequently, but always in spe-

cial relation to the transmission of the *Yajur Veda*. By *Pāṇini*, it is true (iv. 3. 104), he is simply cited generally as a Vedic teacher but the *Mahābhāṣya*, commenting on this passage, describes him as the teacher of *Kaṭha* and *Kāṭya*. In the *Calcutta Scholium*, again, we find further particulars (from what source of *Tārānātha on Siddhānta Kaum.*, i. 590), according to which (see *I St.*, xiii. 440) nine Vedic schools, and among them two belonging to the *Sāma Veda*, trace their origin to him. In the *Rig Gṛhya* he is evidently regarded (see above, pp. 57, 58), after the manner of the *Vishnu Purāṇa*, as the special representative of the *Yajur Veda*, and so he appears in the *Anukṛ.* of the *Ātreya* school, at the head of its list of teachers, specially as the preceptor of *Yāska Paṇḍita*.

Parāśara is represented with especial frequency in the *tantras* of the White Yajus*. We also find repeated allusions in the Brahmanas to a Naumishīya sacrifice, and, on the authority of the Maha-Bharata itself, it was at such a sacrifice that the second recitation of the epic took place in presence of a Śaunaka. But, as has likewise been remarked above [pp 34, 45], these two sacrifices must be kept distinct, and indeed there is no mention in the Brahmanas of a Śaunaka as participating in the former. Nay, several such sacrifices may have taken place in the Naumisha forest [see p 34], or it is possible even that the statement as to the recitation in question may have no more foundation than the desire to give a peculiar consecration to the work. For it is utterly absurd to suppose that Vyāsa Parāśarya and Vaiśampayana—teachers mentioned for the first time in the Tattirīya-Āraṇyaka—could have been anterior to the sacrifice referred to in the Brahmanas. The mention of the "Bharata" and of the "Maha-Bhārata" itself in the Grihya-Sūtras of Āśvalayana [and Saṅkhyayana] we have characterised [p 58] as an interpolation or else an indication that these Sūtras are of very late date. In Panini the word "Maha Bharata" does indeed occur, not, however, as denoting the epic of this name, but as an appellation to designate any individual of special distinction among the Bharatas, like Maha-Jabala, Haulihula (see *I St*, ii 73). Still, we do find names mentioned in Panini which belong specially to the story of the Maha-Bharata—namely, Yudhishtira, Hastinapura, Vasudeva, Arjuna,† Andhaka-Vrishnayas, Drona (?), so that the legend must in any case have been current in his day, possibly even in a poetical shape, however surprising it may be that the name Pandu‡ is never mentioned by him. The earliest direct

* This renders Lassen's reference (*I AK*, i 629) of the name Parāśarya to the astronomer or chronologer Parāśara, highly questionable.

† A worshipper of Vāsudeva, or of Arjuna, is styled 'Vāsudevaka,' 'Arjunaka.' Or is Arjuna here still a name of Indra? [From the context he is to be understood as a Kshatriya, see on this, *I St*, xii 349 ff., *Ind. Antig* iv 246]

‡ This name only occurs in the

Mahā Bhārata and in the works resting upon it. Yet the Buddhists mention a mountain tribe of Pāṇḍavas, as alike the foes of the Śākya (i.e., the Kosalis) and of the inhabitants of Ujjayini, see Schiefner, *Leben des Śākyamuni*, pp 4 40 (in the latter passage they appear to be connected with Takshashila), and, further Lassen, *I AK* ii 100 ff. Foucaux, *Fgja Chér Rol Pa*, pp 228, 229 (25, 26)

evidence of the existence of an epic, with the contents of the Maha-Bhārata, comes to us from the rhetor Dion Chrysostom, who flourished in the second half of the first century A D, and it appears fairly probable that the information in question was then quite new, and was derived from mariners who had penetrated as far as the extreme south of India, as I have pointed out in the *Indische Studien*, II 161-165*. Since Megasthenes says nothing of this epic, it is not an improbable hypothesis that its origin is to be placed in the interval between his time and that of Chrysostom, for what ignorant† sailors took note of would hardly have escaped his observation, more especially if what he narrates of Herakles and his daughter Pandaia has reference really to Krishna and his sister, the wife of Arjuna, if, that is to say, the Pāndu legend was already actually current in his time. With respect to this latter legend, which forms the subject of the Maha-Bhārata, we have already remarked, that although there occur, in the Yajus especially, various names and particulars having an intimate connection with it, yet on the other hand these are presented to us in essentially different relations. Thus the Kuru-Pañchalas in particular, whose internecine feud is deemed by Lassen to be the leading and central feature of the Maha-Bhārata, appear in the Yajus on the most friendly and peaceful footing. Arjuna again, the chief hero of the Pāndus, is still, in the Vajasaneyi-Samuta and the Śatapatha-Brahmana, a name of Indra ‡ and lastly, Janamejaya Párikshita, who in the Maha-Bharata is the great-grandson of Arjuna, appears, in the last part of the Śatapatha-Brahmana, to be still fresh in the memory of the people, with the rise and downfall of himself and his house. I have also already expressed the conjecture that it is perhaps in the deeds and downfall of this Janamejaya that we have to look for the original plot

* It is not, however, necessary to suppose, as I did, &c. that they brought this intelligence from the south of India itself: they might have picked it up at some other part of their voyage.

† That they were so appears from their statement as to the Great Bear &c.

‡ In the thirteenth book of the Śatapatha-Brahmana, Indra also bears the name Dharma, which in the Maha-Bhārata is especially associated with Yudhishtira himself, though only in the forms *dharma raja*, *dharma putra* &c.

of the story of the Maha-Bharata,* and, on the other hand, that, as in the epics of other nations, and notably in the Persian Epos, so too in the Maha Bharata, the myths relating to the gods became linked with the popular legend. But so completely have the two been interwoven that the unravelling of the respective elements must ever remain an impossibility. One thing, however, is clearly discernible in the Maha-Bharata that it has as its basis a war waged on the soil of Hindustan between Aryan tribes, and therefore belonging probably to a time when their settlement in India, and the subjugation and brahmanisation of the native inhabitants had already been accomplished. But what it was that gave rise to the conflict—whether disputes as to territory, or it may be religious dissensions—cannot now be determined.—Of the Maha Bharata in its extant form, only about one-fourth (some 20 000 *ślohas* or so) relates to this conflict and the myths that have been associated with it,²⁰¹ while the elements composing the remaining three-fourths do not belong to it at all, and have only the loosest possible connection therewith as well as with each other. There later additions are of two kinds. Some are of an epic character, and are due to the endeavour to unite here, as in a single focus, all the ancient legends it was possible to muster,—and amongst them, as a matter of fact, are not a few that are tolerably antique even in respect of form. Others are of purely didactic import, and have been inserted with the view of imparting to the military caste, for which the work was mainly intended, all possible instruction as to its duties, and especially as to the reverence due to the priesthood. Even at the portion which is recognisable as the original basis—that relating to the war—many generations must have laboured before the text attained to an approximately settled shape. It is noteworthy that it is precisely in this part that repeated allusion is made to the Yavanas, Sakas, Pahlavas,²⁰² and other peoples, and that

* Which of course stands in glaring contradiction to the statement that the Maha Bharata was recited in his presence.

²⁰¹ And even of this two-thirds will have to be sifted out as not original since in the introduction

to the work (p. 81) the express intimation is still preserved that it previously consisted of 8800 *śloka*, only.

²⁰² In connection with the word *Pahlava*. Th. Holdeke, in a communication dated 3d November

these, moreover, appear as taking an actual part in the conflict—a circumstance which necessarily presupposes that at the time when these passages were written, collisions with the Greeks, &c., had already happened.²⁰² But as to the period when the final redaction of the entire work in its present shape took place, no approach even to a direct conjecture is in the meantime possible,²⁰³ but at any rate, it must have been some centuries after the commencement of our era.* An interesting discovery has

1875, mentions a point which, if confirmed, will prove of the highest importance for determining the date of composition of the *Mahā Bhārata* and of the *Rāmāyana* (see my Essay on it, pp. 22, 25) as well as of *Manu* (see x. 43). According to this, there exists considerable doubt whether the word *Pallava*, which is the basis of *Pallava*, and which Olshausen (1 sup., p. 4, note) regards as having arisen out of the name of the *Parthians*, *Parthians*, can have originated earlier than the first century A.D. This weakening of *tā* to *ā* is not found, in the case of the word *Nidāra*, for example, before the commencement of our era (in the *MILPO* on the coins of the Indo-Scythians, Lassen, *I. AK.*, II. 337 and in *Mehrdates in Tacitus*). As the name of a people, the word *Pallava* became early foreign to the Persians, learned reminiscences excepted in the *Pahlavi* texts themselves, for instance, it does not occur. The period when it passed over to the Indians, therefore, would have to be fixed for about the 2d-4th century A.D. and we should have to understand by it, not directly the Persians, who are called *Pārasikas*, rather, but specially the *Aras* Indian *Parthians*.

²⁰² Of especial interest in this connection is the statement in II. 578, 579, where the Yavana prince *Bhagadatta* (*Apollodotus* (?), according to von Gutschmid's conjecture *reg.* after B.C. 160) appears as sovereign of *Maru* (*Marwar*) and *Naraka*, as ruling *Varuna* like, the west

and as the old friend of *Yudhishtira's* father, see *I. St.*, v. 152.—In the name of the Yavana prince *Kaserumant*, we appear to have a reflex of the title of the Roman *Cæsars*, see *Ind. St.*, pp. 83, 91, cf. L. Feer on the *Ākṣarādhya-samgrahita* of the *Avadāta-Śrūti* in the *Sāstras de l'Asie au Ind* (1871) pp. 47, 56, 60.

²⁰³ With regard to the existence, so early as the time of the *Mahābhārata*, of a poetical version of the *Mahā Bhārata* legend, see *I. St.*, xiii. 356 ff. "Still this does not in the smallest degree prove the existence of the work in a form at all resembling the shape in which we now have it, and as the final result, we do not advance materially beyond the passage in *Dion Chrysostom* (*I. St.*, II. 161 ff.), relating to the 'Indian Homer'. For the statements of the Greek writer themselves evidently date from an earlier time, and although not necessarily derived, as Lassen supposes, from *Megasthenes* himself, yet they at any rate take us back to a period pretty nearly coincident with that of the *Bhāṣya*."

* We have a most significant illustration of the gradual growth of the *Mahā Bhārata* in an episode commented upon by *Saṅkara*, which by the time of *Nilakantha* (i.e., in the course of 6 or 7 centuries) had become expanded by a whole chapter of 47 *śloka*s—see my *Anal. of the Sanskrit MSS. of the Bṛhad. IG.*, p. 108.

recently been made in the island of Bali, near Java, of the Kavi translation of several *parians* of the Mahā-Bharata, which in extent appear to vary considerably from their Indian form.²⁰⁴ A special comparison of the two would not be without importance for the criticism of the Mahā-Bharata. For the rest, in consequence of the utter medley it presents of passages of widely different dates, the work, in general is only to be used with extreme caution. It has been published at Calcutta,²⁰⁵ together with the *Hari-tansa* a poem which passes as a supplement to it*—Respecting the *Jaimini-Bhārata*, which is ascribed, not to Vyasa and Vaiśampayana, but to Jaimini, we have as yet no very precise information the one book of it with which I am acquainted is wholly different from the corresponding book of the ordinary Mahā-Bharata.†

²⁰⁴ See the observations, following R. Friederich's account, in *I St.*, II. 136 ff.

²⁰⁵ 1834-39 in four vols. recently also at Bombay (1863) with the commentary of Nīlakantha Hipolyte Fauche's incomplete French translation (1863-72, ten vols.) can only pass for a translation in a very qualified sense, see as to this *I St.*, II. 410 ff. Individual portions of the work have been frequently handled e.g., Pavis has translated nine pieces (Paris, 1844) and Foucaux eleven (Paris 1862). Bopp, it is well known early made the finest episodes accessible, beginning with the *Nala* (London, 1819) whereby he at the same time laid the foundation for the criticism of the Mahā-Bhārata, the ground was broken and important results achieved by Lassen in his *Indische Alterthums Kunde* (vol. 1 1847). For the contents of the work, see Monier Williams's *Indian Epic Poetry* (1863), and *Indian Wisdom* (1875).

* In Albinus's time, the 11th century, it passed as a leading authority see *Journ. Asiat.*, Aug. 1844, p. 130. [Subandhu, author of the *V. avadatta*, laid it before him, in

the 7th century, see *I St.*, I. 380. A French translation by A. Langlois appeared in 1834.]

† See my *Catal. of the Sanskrit MSS. in the Berl. Lib.*, pp. 111-118 according to Wilson (*Asiat. Coll.*, II. 1) this book would appear to be the only one in existence, see also Weigle in *Z. D. M. G.*, II. 278. [This book the *dhramedhikam parva*, was printed at Bombay in 1863, according to its concluding statements as they appear in this edition, Jaimini's work embraced the entire epos, but up to the present, apart from this 13th book, nothing further is known of it, see as to this my paper in the *Monatsberichte der Berl. Acad.*, 1869 p. 10 ff. A Kanarese translation of this book is assigned to the beginning of the 13th century (*ibid.*, pp. 13, 35), quite recently, however by Kittel, in his Preface to Nagvarma's *Prosody* pp. vi. lxx. it has been relegated to the middle of the 18th (?) century. The peculiar colouring of the Krishna sect, which pervades the whole book, is noteworthy, Christian legendary matter and other Western influences are unmistakably present *Monatsb.*, I c, p. 37 ff. A good part of the contents has been communicated by

Side by side with the Itihāsa we find the *Purāna* mentioned in the Brāhmanas, as the designation of those cosmogonic inquiries which occur there so frequently, and which relate to the 'āgra' or 'beginning' of things. When in course of time distinct works bearing this name arose, the signification of the term was extended, and these works came to comprehend also the history of the created world, and of the families of its gods and heroes, as well as the doctrine of its various dissolutions and renovations in accordance with the theory of the mundane periods (*yugas*). As a rule, five such topics are given as forming their subject (see Lassen, *I AK*, I 479), whence the epithet *Pañcha-lakṣaṇa*, which is cited in Amara's lexicon as a synonym of *Purāna*. These works have perished, and those that have come down to us in their stead under the name of *Purānas* are the productions of a later time, and belong all of them to the last thousand years or so. They are written (cf. Lassen, *l c*) in the interests of, and for the purpose of recommending, the Śiva and Vishnu sects, and not one of them corresponds exactly, a few correspond slightly, and others do not correspond at all, with the description of the ancient *Purānas* preserved to us in the Scholiasts of Amara, and also here and there in the works themselves. "For the old narratives, which are in part abridged, in part omitted altogether, have been substituted theological and philosophical doctrines, ritual and ascetic precepts, and especially legends recommending a particular divinity or certain shrines" (Lassen, *I AK*, I 481). Yet they have unquestionably preserved much of the matter of these older works, and accordingly it is not uncommon to meet with lengthy passages, similarly worded, in several of them at the same time. Generally speaking, as regards the traditions of primitive times, they closely follow the *Mahā-Bhārata* as their authority, but they likewise advert, though uniformly in a prophetic tone, to the historic

Talboys Wheeler in his *History of India*, vol. I. (1867), where, too, there is a general sketch of the contents of the *Mahā-Bhārata* itself see *I Str*, II 392.—It remains further to mention the recast of the *Mahā-Bhārata* by the Jaina Amaraśāstra which next antedates the title *Bhāṣa Bhārata*,—in 44 surgar of 6550 *anushṭubh* verses,—and which appeared in the Benares Pandit (1869 ff) edited by Vecchana Pāmasāstrin. This work belongs probably to the 11th century, see *J D, M O*, xxvi 170

lines of kings. Here, however, they come into the most violent conflict, not only with each other, but with chronology in general, so that their historical value in this respect is extremely small. Their number is considerable, amounting to eighteen, and is doubled if we reckon the so-called *Upapurānas*, in which the epic character has been thrust still more into the background, while the ritual element has come quite to the front. Up to this time only one single Purāna, the *Bhagavata-Purana*, has been published—the greater part of it at least—edited [and translated] by Burnouf but of the others we have excellent notices in Wilson's translation of the *Vishnu-Purana*.²¹⁸

As the second group of Epic Poetry we designated the *Kāvya*s, which are ascribed to certain definite poets (*kavis*), whereas the *Itihasas* and *Puranas* are attributed to a mythical personage, Vyasa, who is simply *Διασκευή* (Redaction) personified*. At the head of these poems stands the *Rāmāyana* of Valmiki, whose name we found cited among the teachers of the Taittiriya-Pratishakhya†. In respect of language, this work is closely related to the war portion of the *Maha-Bharata* although in individual cases, where the poet displays his full elegance, it bears plainly enough on its surface, in rhyme and metre, the traces of a later date. In

²¹⁸ As also in the separate analyses of various Purānas now collected in vol. 1 of Wilson's *Essays on Sanskrit Literature* (ed. Rost, 1864). Above all, we have here to mention, further the minute accounts given of the Purānas by Aufrecht in his *Catal. Cod. Sansc. Bibl. Bodl.* pp. 7-87. The *Vishnu Purana* has been recently published at Bombay with the commentary of Ratnagarbha bhatta (1867), Wilson's translation of it has been republished edited by Fitzedward Hall in five vols. (1864-1870), with material additions and corrections. There are now also several editions of the *Bhāgavata Purana*, amongst them one with the comm. of Śrīdharaśvāmin (Bombay, 1860). The *Mahābhārata Purana* has been edited in the *Bibl. Indica* by K. M. Banerjee (1855-1862), and the *Agni Purana* is now

appearing in the same series (begun 1870, caps. 1-214 thus far). An impression of the *Kalki Purana* appeared at Calcutta in 1873 and lithographed editions of the *Līlā Purana* (1858) and of portions of the *Padma*, *Ślānda*, *Garuḍa*, *Brahma*, *Varaha*, and other Purānas have appeared at Bombay, see *I. Str.* n. 245 ff., 301 ff.

* The words *kavi* in the sense of 'singer-poet, and *kāvya*, in that of 'song-poem,' are repeatedly used in the Veda, but without any technical application see *Vājas. Samh. Spec.* n. 187 [*trayā vai vidyā Lāvyaṃ chāndas, Śat. viii. 5. 2. 4*].

† Whether by this name we have to understand the same person is of course not certain, but considering the singularity of the name, it is at least not improbable.

regard to contents, on the contrary, the difference between it and this portion of the *Mahā-Bharata* is an important one. In the latter human interest everywhere preponderates, and a number of well-defined personages are introduced, to whom the possibility of historical existence cannot be denied, and who were only at a later stage associated with the myths about the gods. But in the *Rāmāyana* we find ourselves from the very outset in the region of allegory, and we only move upon historical ground in so far as the allegory is applied to an historical fact, namely, to the spread of Aryan civilisation towards the south, more especially to Ceylon. The characters are not real historic figures, but merely personifications of certain occurrences and situations. Sita, in the first place, whose abduction by a giant demon, and subsequent recovery by her husband Rāma, constitute the plot of the entire poem, is but the field-furrow, to which we find divine honours paid in the songs of the *Rik*, and still more in the *Grihya* ritual. She accordingly represents Aryan husbandry, which has to be protected by Rāma—whom I regard as originally identical with Balarama “*balabhrī*,” “the plough-bearer,” though the two were afterwards separated—against the attacks of the predatory aborigines. These latter appear as demons and giants, whereas those natives who were well disposed towards the Aryan civilisation are represented as monkeys,—a comparison which was doubtless not exactly intended to be flattering, and which rests on the striking ugliness of the Indian aborigines as compared with the Aryan race. Now this allegorical form of the *Rāmāyana* certainly indicates, *a priori*, that this poem is later than the war-part of the *Mahā-Bharata*, and we might fairly assume, further, that the historical events upon which the two works are respectively based stand to each other in a similar relation. For the colonisation of Southern India could hardly begin until the settlement of Hindustan by the Aryans had been completed, and the feuds that arose there had been fought out. It is not, however, altogether necessary to suppose the latter, and the warfare at least which forms the basis of the *Mahā-Bharata* might have been waged concurrently with expeditions of other Aryan tribes to the south. Whether it was really the *Kośalas*, as whose chief Rāma appears in the *Rāmāyana*, who

effected the colonisation of the south,* as stated in the poem, or whether the poet merely was a Kōśāla, who claimed this honour for his people and royal house, is a point upon which it is not yet possible to form a judgment. He actually represents Śita as the daughter of Janaka, king of the Videhas, a tribe contiguous to the Kōśālas, and renowned for his piety. The scanty knowledge of South India displayed in the Ramayana has been urged as proving its antiquity, since in the Maha-Bharata this region appears as far more advanced in civilisation, and as enjoying ample direct communication with the rest of India. But in this circumstance I can only see evidence of one of two things—either that the poet did not possess the best geographical knowledge, whereas many generations have worked at the Maha-Bharata, and made it their aim to magnify the importance of the conflict by grouping round it as many elements as possible—or else—and this is the point I would particularly emphasise—that the poet rightly apprehended and performed the task he had set himself, and so did not mix up later conditions, although familiar to him, with the earlier state of things. The whole plan of the Ramayana favours the assumption that we have here to do with the work, the poetical creation, of one man. Considering the extent of the work, which now numbers some 24,000 ślohas, this is saying a great deal, and before epic poetry could have attained to such a degree of perfection, it must already have passed through many phases of development.† Still,

* It was by them also—by Bhagīrata, namely—that, according to the Rāmāyaṇa, the mouths of the Ganges were discovered. Properly they were the Eastern rather than the Southern foreposts of the Aryans.

† Of these phases we have probably traces in the *grantha* Śiṣa *braṇḍīya* [to this Goldstucker in his *Pāṇini*, p. 28, takes exception, doubtless correctly; see *I St.*, v. 27], *amaṣabḥīya*, *Indrajananṭīya*, mentioned by Pāṇini, iv. 3. 88, and in the *Allypūras* and *Chāndarḍas* which, according to Pāṇini, vi. 2. 103, are to be variously designated according to the different points of the

compass. The term *Chāndarḍa* still remains unintelligible to me; see *I St.*, i. 153. (For the rest, as stated by the Calcutta scholiast, this rule, vi. 2. 103 is not interpreted in the *Bhāṣya* of Patanjali, it may possibly therefore not be Pāṇini's at all, but posterior to the time of Patanjali.)—The word *grantha* may have reference either to the outward fastening (like the German *Heft, Band*) or to the inner composition which of the two we have to suppose remains still undecided, but I am inclined to pronounce for the former. [See above pp. 15, 99, 165.]

it is by no means implied that the poem was of these dimensions from the first here, too, many parts are certainly later additions, for example, all those portions in which Rāma is represented as an incarnation of Vishnu, all the episodes in the first book, the whole of the seventh book, &c. The poem was originally handed down orally, and was not fixed in writing until afterwards, precisely like the Mahā-Bhārata. But here we encounter the further peculiar circumstance—which has not yet been shown to apply, in the same way at all events, to the latter work—namely, that the text has come down to us in several distinct recensions, which, while they agree for the most part as to contents, yet either follow a different arrangement, or else vary throughout, and often materially, in the expression. This is hardly to be explained save on the theory that this fixing of the text in writing took place independently in different localities. We possess a complete edition of the text by G. Gorresio, containing the so-called Bengālī recension, and also two earlier editions which break off with the second book, the one published at Serampore by Carey and Marshman, the other at Bonn by A. W. von Schlegel. The manuscripts of the Berlin library contain, it would seem, a fourth recension.*

* See my Catalogue of these MSS, p. 119. [Two complete editions of the text, with Rāma's Commentary, have since appeared in India, the one at Calcutta in 1859-60, the other at Bombay in 1859 respecting the latter, see my notice in *J. Str.*, ii. 235-245. Gorresio's edition was completed by the appearance in 1867 of the text, and in 1870 of the translation, of the *Uttara-kāṇḍa*. Hippolyte Fauche's French translation follows Gorresio's text, whereas Griffith's metrical English version (Benares, 1870-74, in 5 vols.) follows the Bombay edition. In my Essay, *Über das Rāmāyanam* 1870 (an English translation of which appeared in the *Indian Antiquary* for 1872, also separately at Bombay in 1873), I have attempted to show that the modifications which the story of Rāma, as known to us

in its earliest shape in Buddhist legends, underwent in the hands of Vālmiki, rest upon an acquaintance with the conceptions of the Trojan cycle of legend, and I have likewise endeavoured to determine more accurately the position of the work in literary history. The conclusion there arrived at is, that the date of its composition is to be placed towards the commencement of the Christian era, and at all events in an epoch when the operation of Greek influence upon India had already set in. This elicited a rejoinder from Kashinath Trimbak Telang (1873) entitled, *Was the Rāmāyana copied from Homer*, to which see *Ind. Ant.*, ii. 209 *J. Str.*, xli. 336, 480. The same writer afterwards, in the *Ind. Ant.* iii. 124, 267, pointed out a half *śloka* which occurs in the *Yuddha-kāṇḍa*,

Between the Rāmāyana and the remaining Kavyas there exists a gap similar to that between the Maha-Bharata and the extant Puranas. Towards filling up this blank we might perhaps employ the titles of the Kavyas found in the Kavi language in the island of Bali,²⁰⁷ most of which certainly come from Sanskrit originals. In any case, the emigration of Hindūs to Java, whence they subsequently passed over to Bali, must have taken place at a time when the Kavya literature was particularly flourishing, otherwise we could not well explain the peculiar use they have made of the terms *kavi* and *kāvya*. Of the surviving Kavyas, the most independent in character, and on that account ranking next to the Ramayana—passably pure, too, in respect of form—are two works* bearing the name of Kalidasa, namely, the *Raghu-vaṇśa* and the *Kumāra-sambhava* (both extant in Kavi also). The other Kāvya, on the contrary, uniformly follow, as regards their subject, the Maha-Bharata or the Ramayana, and they are also plainly enough distinguished from the two just mentioned by their language and form of exposition. This latter abandons more and more the epic domain and passes into the erotic, lyrical, or didactic-descriptive field, while the language is more and more overlaid with turgid bombast,

and also twice in Patanjali's *Mahā bhāṣya*. But the verse contains a mere general reflection (*eti jñātam daando naraṇa varahasafed aṇa*), and need not therefore have been derived from the Rāmāyana. In itself, consequently it proves nothing as to the priority of the poem to Patanjali, and this all the less, as it is expressly cited by Vālmiki himself merely as a quotation. On this and some other kindred points see my letter in the *Ind Ant* iv 247 ff (1875).]

²⁰⁷ See Friederich, *l c*, I St, ii 139 ff. The numerous traces which are contained in Patanjali's *Mahā bhāṣya* of epic or narrative poems then actually extant, and which appear in that work as direct quotations therefrom, take us back to a far earlier time, see I St, iii. 463 ff.

* They have been edited by Stenzler, text with translation (and repeatedly in India since, with or without the commentary of Mallinātha. To the seven books of the *Kumāra sambhava*, which were the only ones previously known ten others have recently been added, on the critical questions connected with these see *eg Z D M G*, xxvii 174-182 (1873). From the astrological data contained in both works, H Jacobi has shown in the *Monatsber der Berl. Acad*, 1873, p 556 that the date of their composition cannot be placed earlier than about the middle of the 4th century A D. The *Raghu vaṇśa* was most probably composed in honour of a Ehoja prince—see my Essay on the *P'ū Tāp Up* p 279, I St, i. 312].

until at length, in its latest phases, this artificial epic resolves itself into a wretched jungle of words. A pretended elegance of form, and the performance of difficult tricks and feats of expression, constitute the main aim of the poet, while the subject has become a purely subordinate consideration, and merely serves as the material which enables him to display his expertness in manipulating the language.²⁰³

Next to the epic, as the second phase in the development of Sanskrit poetry, comes the Drama. The name for it is *Nāṭaka*, and the player is styled *Nāṭa*, literally 'dancer'. Etymology thus points us to the fact that the drama has developed out of dancing, which was probably accompanied, at first, with music and song only, but in course of time also with pantomimic representations, processions, and dialogue. We find dancing repeatedly mentioned in the songs of the Rik (e.g., in 1. 10. 1, 92. 4, &c.), but with special frequency in the Atharva-Saṃhita and the Yajus,* though everywhere still under the root-form

²⁰³ Six of these artificial epics are specially entitled *Mahakāvya*. These are, in addition to the *Raghuvaṇśa* and *Kumārā-saṃbhava* — (1) the *Bhāṭṭi-kāvya*, in 22 *sargas*, composed in Valabhi under king Śrī Dharasena (xiii. 35) in the 6th or 7th cent. therefore, it deals with the story of Rāma, and is written with a special reference to grammar; (2) the *Māgha-kāvya* or *Subhāṭṭa-badha* of Māgha, the son of Dattaka, in 22 *sargas* (Suprabhadeva, grand father of the poet, is described as the minister of a king Śrī Dharmasambha), and (3) the *Karṇāṭya* of Bhārovi, in 18 *sargas*, — both prior to Haldynda (end of the 10th cent.), see *I Str.* viii. 193, 195, 196. (4) the *Naṭakāṭya* of Śrī Harsha, in 22 *sargas*, of the 12th cent. (see Bühler in the *Journal Bombay D. R. A. S.*, x. 35). The *Raghuvamśa* of Kaviśa, in any case later than the 10th cent. (see *I Str.*, i. 371), enjoys a high esteem, it handles, in the self same words, at once the story of the Rāmāyana and that of the

Mahā Bhārata, and, like the *Nāṭakāṭya*, is 4 *sargas*, which is even ascribed to Kālidāsa (edited so long ago as 1830 by Ferd. Benary), is one of the most characteristically artificial pieces of this class of poetry. All these works have been frequently published in India, and to them are to be added many other similar productions. — The Prakrit poem *Setu-bandha* or *Rāvaṇa-bandha*, which relates to the story of Rāma, and is reputed to be by Kālidāsa, also merits special mention here. Of this Paul Goldschmidt has already published two chapters (Göttingen, 1873), and Siegfried Goldschmidt is engaged on an edition of the entire text.

* With various kinds of musical accompaniment, according to the Vāṛ Saṃh. xix, where we meet with quite a number of musicians and dancers as well as with the name *Saṅkīrṇa* itself, which, at a later time, at all events, belongs specially to actors, see *I Str.*, i. 76-83. According to the scholium on Kāṭy. xii. 4. 3 by the "śāstrīyagaurava

nat The prakritized form *naṭ* occurs for the first time in Pāṇini, who, besides, informs us of the existence of distinct Nata-sūtras,* or manuals for the use of *naṭas*, one of which was attributed to Śilālin, and another to Kṛiṣaśva, their adherents being styled Śailalinas and Kṛiṣaśvinas respectively. The former of these names finds an analogue, at least, in the patronymic Śailali, which occurs in the thirteenth *lāṇḍa* of the Satapatha-Brahmana, and it may also, perhaps, be connected with the words Śailūsha and Kuśilava, both of which denote 'actor' (?)† The latter name, on the contrary, is a very surprising one in this connection, being otherwise only known to us as the name of one of the old heroes who belong in common to the Hindūs and the Parsis‡. Beyond this allusion we have no vestige of either of these works. Pāṇini further cites§ the word *nāṭyam* in the sense of '*natānām dharmā āmnāyo vā*'. In both cases, we have probably to understand by the term the art of dancing, and not dramatic art.—It has been uniformly held hitherto that the Indian drama arose, after the manner of our modern drama in the Middle Ages, out of religious solemnities and spectacles (so-called 'mysteries'), and also that dancing originally subserved religious purposes. But in support of this latter assumption, I have not met with one single instance in the Śrauta- or Grihya-Sūtras with which I am acquainted (though of the latter, I confess, I have only a very super-

ye *sampādāyeyuḥ*" as the text has it, we have to understand specially teachers of dancing, music, and singing. "In the man who dances and sings, women take delight," Śat., iii. 2. 4. 6.

* The two rules in question, iv 3 110, 111 according to the Calcutta scholiast, are not explained in the Bhāṣya of Patanjali possibly, therefore, they may not be Pāṇini's at all but posterior to the time of Patanjali. [The *Śailalīna nāṭak* are mentioned in the Bhāṣya to iv 2. 56, in the Anuśāsanīya-sūtra, the *Śailalīna* are cited as a ritual school, see *I St*, xiii 429.]

† The *o* terms are probably derived from *ala* and refer to the

corrupt, loose morals of those so designated, and the same must apply to Śilāli, if this be a cognate word. The derivation from Kuśa and Lava, the two sons of Rāma, at the beginning of the Rāmāyana, has manifestly been invented in order to escape the odium of the name 'kuśilava.'

‡ Ought we here to understand the name literally, as, perhaps, a kind of mocking epithet to express poverty, with at the same time, possibly, a direct ironical reference to the renowned Kṛiṣaśva of old?

§ iv 3 129 this rule, also, is not explained in the Bhāṣya, perhaps therefore it is not Pāṇini's, but later than Patanjali.

ficial knowledge)²⁰⁹ The religious significance of dancing is thus, for the older period at least, still questionable; and since it is from dancing that the drama has evidently sprung, the original connection of the latter with religious solemnities and spectacles becomes doubtful also. Besides, there is the fact that it is precisely the most ancient dramas that draw their subjects from civil life, while the most modern, on the contrary, almost exclusively serve religious purposes. Thus the contrary, rather, would seem to be the case, namely, that the employment of dancing* and of the drama at religious solemnities was only the growth of a later age²¹⁰ This does not imply, however, that dancing was excluded from those great sacrificial festivals which were now and then celebrated by princes; but only that it did not itself constitute part of the sacred rite or religious ceremony, and could only, and did only, find a place in the intervals. The name applied to the stage-manager in the dramas themselves, 'Sutra-dhāra,' is referred, and no

²⁰⁹ Even now I am acquainted with but little from these sources bearing on this point. Amongst other things, at the *gṛamedha* we find dancing, music, and song, which represent the three forms of *ilpa* or art (*Śākh. Br.* 29 5), prescribed for the whole day, *Kāty.*, 21 3 11. But a *Sṇḍika* might not participate in any such performance, either actively or passively, *Pār.* ii. 7. On the day preceding the departure of a bride, four or eight married women (unwidowed) performed a dance in her house, *Śākh. Gr.* i. 11.

* It is known in the *Megha-dūta*, v. 35, 36.

²¹⁰ Through the unexpected light shed by the *Mahābhāṣya* of Patanjali on the then flourishing condition of theatrical representation, this question has recently taken a form very favourable to the view of which Lassen is the principal exponent, and which regards the drama as having originated in religious spectacles resembling our mysteries. The particulars there given regarding the performance of

a *Kaṇṇaradhā* and *Valibandha* by so-called *śaṣṭhās* in *Hārivali*, 151, though these are explained as *śāṇḍīlā*, 'jugglers,' of *śobha*, *śobhanagaraka*, *I. St.*, iii. 153)—lead us directly to this conclusion, see *I. St.*, xii. 354, 487 ff. "But between the dramatic representations known in the *Bhāṣya*, which bear more or less the character of religious festival plays, and the earliest real dramas that have actually come down to us, we must of course suppose a very considerable interval of time, during which the drama gradually rose to the degree of perfection exhibited in these extant pieces, and here I am still disposed to assign a certain influence to the witnessing of Greek plays. The Indian drama, after having acquitted itself brilliantly in the most varied fields—notably too as a drama of civil life—finally reverted in its closing phases to essentially the same class of subjects with which it had started—to represent *it was from the story of the gods.*"—*Ibid.*, pp. 491, 492.

doubt rightly, to the original sense of '(measuring) Inholder,' 'carpenter,'* since it appears to have been one of the duties of the architect at these sacrificial celebrations, over and above the erection of the buildings for the reception of those taking part in the sacrifice, likewise to conduct the various arrangements that were to serve for their amusement. (See Lassen, *I AK*, II 503) Whether the *nāṭas* and *nāṭakas* mentioned on such occasions are to be understood as dancers or actors, is at least doubtful, but in the absence of any distinct indication that the latter are intended, I hold in the meantime to the etymological signification of the word, and it is only where the two appear together (e.g., in *Rāmāy* I. 12. 7 Gorr) that *nāṭa* has certainly to be taken in the sense of 'actor' Buddhist legend seems, indeed, in one instance—in the story of the life of Maudgalyayana and Upatishya, two disciples of Buddha—to refer to the representation of dramas in the presence of these individuals† But here a question at once arises as to the age of the work in which this reference occurs, this is the main point to be settled before we can base any conclusion upon it. Lassen, it is true, says that "in the oldest Buddhist writings the witnessing of plays is spoken of as something usual," but the sole authority he adduces is the passage from the *Dulva* indicated in the note. The *Dulva*, however, that is, the *Vinaya-Pitaka*, cannot, as is well known, be classed amongst the "oldest Buddhist writings," it contains pieces of widely different dates, in part, too, of extremely questionable antiquity. In the *Lalitā-Vistara*, apropos of the testing of Buddha in the

* And therefore has probably nothing to do with the *Nāṭa* *śāstra* mentioned above! For another application of the word by the Buddhists, see Lassen, *I AK*, II. 81. Of a marionette theatre, at all events, we must not think, though the Javanese puppet shows might tempt us to do so.

† Coma Kōrō I, who gives an account of this in *As. Res* xx. 50 uses these phrases "They meet on the occasion of a festival at Rājagṛha their behaviour during the several exhibitions of spectacles—

their mutual addresses after the shows are over" By 'spectacle' must we here necessarily understand 'dramatic spectacle, drama'! (Precisely the same thing applies to the word *visuka* which properly only signifies 'merrymaking' in the *Suttas* of the Southern Buddhists, where the witnessing of such exhibitions (*visūla-dassana*) is mentioned among the reproaches directed by Bhagavanta against the worldly ways of the Brahmins, see Burnouf, *Lotus de la Bonne Loi*, p. 465; *I Sk.* III. 152-154.)

various arts and sciences (Foucaux, p 150), *nāṭya* must, undoubtedly, be taken in the sense of 'mimetic art'—and so Foucaux translates it, but this does not suppose the existence of distinct dramas. The date, moreover, of this particular work is by no means to be regarded as settled, and, in any case, for the time of Buddha himself, this examination-legend carries no weight whatever.

With respect, now, to the surviving dramas, it has hitherto been usual to follow what is supposed to be the tradition, and to assign the most ancient of them, the *Mṛichhakatī* and Kālidāsa's pieces, to the first century A.C., while the pieces next following—those of Bhavabhūti—belong to a time so late as the eighth century A.D. Between Kālidāsa and Bhavabhūti there would thus be a gap of some eight or nine centuries—a period from which, according to this view, not one single work of this class has come down to us. Now this is in itself in the highest degree improbable, and were it so, then surely at the very least there ought to be discernible in the dramas of the younger epoch a very different spirit, a very different manner of treatment, from that exhibited in their predecessors of an age eight or nine hundred years earlier*. But this is by no means the case, and thus we are compelled at once to reject this pretended tradition, and to refer those *soi-disant* older pieces to pretty much the same period as those of Bhavabhūti. Moreover, when we come to examine the matter more closely, we find that, so far as Kālidāsa is concerned, Indian tradition does not really furnish any ground whatever for the view hitherto accepted: we only find that the tradition has been radically misused. The tradition is to the effect that Kālidāsa lived at the court of Vikramāditya, and it is contained in a memorial verse which says that Dhanvantari, Kshapanaka, Amarasiṃha, Śaṅku, Vetalabhāta, Ghatakarpāra, Kālidāsa, Varahamihira, and Vararuchi† were the 'nine gems' of Vikrama's

* I have here copied Holtzmann's words, referring to Amara, in his excellent little treatise, *Ueber den griechischen Ursprung der indischen Theaterkreise*, Karlsruhe, 1841, p. 26.

† This is obviously the Vṛncha who is mentioned by the Hindustani chronicler as the author of the *V*

krama-charitra (*Journ. Asiat. Mai*, 1844, p. 356). [This recognition—assigned to Vararuchi—of the *Sibhāsana-dvātrīṃśikā* is actually extant, see Aufrecht *Cat. of Sansk MSS. Libr. Trin. Coll. Camb.*, p. 11, and Westergaard *Catal. Oodd. Or. Bibl. Reg. Haunimura*, p. 100.]

court Now it is upon this one verse—a mere waif and stray, that has come, like Schiller's 'Madchen aus der Fremde,' from nobody knows where,* and which is, in any case, of the most questionable authority—that the assumption rests that Kalidasa flourished in the year 56 B.C. For people were not satisfied with hastily accepting as genuine coin the tradition here presented—and thus notwithstanding the fact that they at the same time unpugned to some extent the trustworthiness of the verse embodying it†—they at once rushed to the conclusion that the Vikrama here named must be the Vikramaditya, whose era, still current in our own day, commences with the year 56 B.C. But then, we know of a good many different Vikramas and Vikramadityas ‡ and, besides, a tradition which is found in some modern works,§ and which ought surely, in the first instance, to have been shown to be baseless before any such conclusion was adopted, states expressly (whether correctly or not is a question by itself) that king Bhoja, the ruler of Málava, who dwelt at Dhara and Ujjayiní, was the Vikrama at whose court the 'nine gems' flourished, and, according to an inscription,|| this king Bhoja lived

* It is alleged to be taken from the Vikrama-charitra, but Roth, in his analysis of this work in the *Journ. Anat.*, Octob 1845, p. 278 ff., says nothing of it. [And in fact it occurs neither there nor in any of the other recensions of the *Sinhāsana-dvātrīṣṭīkā* to which I have access. It is, however, found embodied both in the *Jyotirvid ābharana*, of about the sixteenth century (22. 10, see *Z. D. M. G.*, xxii 723, 1868), and in a Singhalese MS. of the so-called *Navaratna* (with Singhalese commentary) cited in Westergaard's *Catal. Oodd. Or. Bibl. Reg. Haun.*, p. 14 (1846).]

† Partly on erroneous grounds. It was asserted, namely, that the word *Ghṛīṭakarpura* in the verse was only the name of a work, not of a person; this, however, is not the case, as several poems, besides, are found ascribed to him.

‡ 'Sun of might' is quite a general title, and not a name.

§ See, for instance, al o Haeber

lin's *Sanskrit Anthology*, pp 483 484.

|| See Lassen, *Zeitch für die Kunde des Morg.*, vii. 294 ff., Colebrook, ii. 462. According to Rein and in the *Journ. Anat.*, Sept 1844, p. 250, Bhoja is mentioned some years earlier by Albirūnī, who wrote in A.D. 1031, as his contemporary, and Oṭbi alludes to him earlier still, in A.D. 1018 as then reigning, see Reinaud, *Mém. sur l'Inde* p. 261. According to a later Hindustānī chronicler, he lived 542 years after Vikramāditya (see *Journ. Anat. Mai.*, 1844, p. 354), which would make the date of the latter about A.D. 476. Upon what this very precise statement rests, is unfortunately uncertain, the Vikrama-charitra does not fix in this definite way the interval of time between Bhoja and Vikrama. Roth, at all events, in his analysis of the work (*Journ. Anat.*, Sept 1854, p. 281) merely says, "bien des années après (la mort de Vikramaditya) Bhoja parvint au

about 1040-1090 A.D. On the other hand, there exists no positive ground whatever for the opinion that the Vikrama of the verse is *the* Vikramaditya whose era begins in B.C. 56. Nay, the case is stronger still, for up to the present time we have absolutely no authentic evidence* to show whether the era of Vikramaditya dates from the year of his birth, from some achievement, or from the year of his death, or whether, in fine, it may not have been simply introduced by him for astronomical reasons† "To assign him to the first year of his era might be quite as great a mistake as we should commit in placing Pope Gregory XIII. in the year one of the Gregorian Calendar, or even Julius Cæsar in the first year of the Julian period to which his name has been given, i.e., in the year 4713 B.C." (Holtzmann, *op cit.*, p. 19)

vouvenir pousseur." [The text has simply "bahuna varshah gadda." Nor does any definite statement of the kind occur in any of the various other recensions of the *Sihāsana-dvātrīṃśikā*, although a considerable interval is here regularly assumed to have elapsed between the rule of Vikrama at Avanti and that of Bhoja at Dhārā.]—To suppose two Bhojas, as Reinand does, *l. c.*, and *Mém. sur l'Inde*, pp. 113, 114, is altogether arbitrary. We might determine the uncertain date of Vikramaditya by the certain date of Bhoja, but we cannot reverse the process. The date 3044 of Yudhisṭhira's era is, *J. As.*, *l. c.*, p. 357, assigned to the accession of Vikramaditya, but it does not appear whether this is the actual tradition of the Hindustani chronicler, or merely an addition on the part of the translator. Even in the former case, it would still only prove that the chronicler or the tradition he followed, mixed up the common assertion as to the date of Vikrama with the special statement above referred to. [To the statements of the Hindustani chronicler, Mir Qasim Ali Afson, no great importance probably, need be attached. They rest substantially on the recension attributed to Vararuchi of the

Sihāsana dvātrīṃśikā, which, however, in the MS. before me (Trin Coll., Camb.), yields no definite chronological data.—After all, the assumption of several Bhojas has since turned out to be fully warranted, see, e.g. Rājendralāla Mitra in *Journ. A. S. Beng.* 1863, p. 91 ff., and my *J. Str.*, i. 312.]

* See Colebrooke, ii. 475, Lassen, *J. A. K.*, ii. 49, 50, 398, Reinand, *Mém. sur l'Inde* pp. 68 ff., 79 ff., Bertrand in the *Journ. Asiat.*, Mai, 1844, p. 357.

† We first meet with it in the astronomer Varāha Mihira in the fifth or sixth century, though even this is not altogether certain, and, as in the case of Brahmagupta in the seventh century, it might possibly be the era of Śīrāṣṭhana (beg. A.D. 78). Lassen does, in fact, suppose the latter (*J. A. K.*, i. 508), but see Colebrooke, ii. 475.—Albirici gives particulars (v. Reinand *Journ. Asiat.*, Sept. 1844, pp. 282-284) as to the origin of the Saka era, but regarding the basis of the Saka era of Vikrama he does not enlarge. [Even yet these two questions, which are of such capital importance for Indian chronology, are in an altogether unsatisfactory state. According to Kern, *Introd.* to his edition of the

The dramas of Kalidasa—that one of the ‘nine gems’ with whom we are here more immediately concerned—furnish in their contents nothing that directly enables us to determine their date. Still, the mention of the Greek female slaves in attendance upon the king points at least to a time not especially early, while the form in which the popular dialects appear, and which, as compared with that of the inscriptions of Piyadasi, is extraordinarily degraded, not unfrequently coinciding with the present form of these vernaculars, brings us down to a period at any rate several centuries after Christ. But whether the tradition is right in placing Kalidasa at the court of Bhoja in the middle of the eleventh century appears to me very questionable, for this reason in particular, that it assigns to the same court other poets also, whose works, compared with those of Kālidāsa, are so bad, that they absolutely must belong to a later stage than his—for example, Damodara Miśra, author of the *Hanuman-nataka*. Moreover, Kalidasa has allotted to him such a large number of works, in part too of wholly diverse character, that we cannot but admit the existence of several authors of this name, and, in point of fact, it is a name that has continued in constant use down to the present time. Nay, one even of the three dramas that are ascribed to Kalidasa would seem, from its style, to belong to a different author from

Bṛhat-Saṃhitā of Varsha Mihira, 5 ff. (1866), the use of the so-called *Saṃvat* era is not demonstrable for early times at all, while astronomers only begin to employ it after the year 1000 or so. According to Westergaard, *Om de indiske Kyster* (1867), p. 164, the grant of Dantidurga, dated Śaka 675 *Saṃvat* 811 (A.D. 754), is the earliest certain instance of its occurrence, see also Burnell, *Elem. of South Ind. Pal.*, p. 55. Others, on the contrary, have no hesitation in at once referring, wherever possible, every *Saṃvat* or *Saṃvatsara*-dated inscription to the *Saṃvat* era. Thus, e.g., Cunningham in his *Archæol. Survey of India*, iii. 31, 39 directly assigns an inscription dated *Saṃvat* 5 to the year A.C. 52. Dowson, too, has recently

taken the same view, *J. R. A. S.*, vii. 382 (1875). According to Eggeling (*Frühber's Amer. and Or. Lit. Rev.*, special number, 1875, p. 38), one of the inscriptions found in Sir Walter Elliot's copies of grant dates as far back as the year Śaka 169 (A.D. 247). Burnell, however, declares it to be a forgery of the tenth century. Fergusson too, *On the Śaka, Saṃvat, and Gupta Eras* pp. 11-16, is of opinion that the so-called *Saṃvat* era goes no farther back than the tenth century. For the present, therefore unfortunately, where there is nothing else to guide us it must generally remain an open question which era we have to do with in a particular inscription and what date consequently the inscription bears.

the other two²¹¹ And this view is further favoured by the circumstance, that in the introduction to this play Dhāvaka, Saumilla, and Kaviputra are named as the poet's predecessors, Dhāvaka being the name of a poet who flourished contemporaneously with king Śrī Harsha of Kashmir, that is, according to Wilson, towards the beginning of the twelfth century A D²¹² There may, it is

²¹¹ In the introduction to my translation of this drama, the *Mālavikāgnimitra*, I have specially examined not only the question of its genuineness, but also that of the date of Kālidāsa. The result arrived at is, in the first place, that this drama also really belongs to him,—and in this view Shankar Pandit, in his edition of the play (Bombay, 1869), concurs. As to the second point, internal evidence, partly derived from the language, partly connected with the phase of civilisation presented to us leads me to assign the composition of Kālidāsa's three dramas to a period from the second to the fourth century of our era, the period of the Gupta princes, Chandragupta, &c., "whose reigns correspond best to the legendary tradition of the glory of Vikrama, and may perhaps be gathered up in it in one single focus" Lassen has expressed himself to essentially the same effect (*I AK*, II. 457, 1158-1160) see also *I St*, II. 148, 415-417 Kern, however, with special reference to the tradition which regards Kālidāsa and Varāha Mihira as contemporaries, has, in his preface to Varāha's *Bṛhat-Saṃhitā*, p. 20, declared himself in favour of referring the 'nine gems' to the first half of the sixth century A.D. Lastly, on the ground of the astrological data in the *Rumāra-saṃbhava* and *Raghuvaṇś*, Jacoba comes to the conclusion (*Monatsber der Berl. Acad.*, 1873, p. 556) that the author of these two poems cannot have lived before about A.D. 350, but here, of course, the preliminary question remains whether he is to be identi-

fied with the dramatist Shankar Pandit, in Trubner's *An and Or Lit Rec*, 1875, special No., p. 35, assumes this, and fixes Kālidāsa's date as at all events prior to the middle of the eighth century. For a definite chronological detail which is perhaps furnished by the *Meḡha-dūta*, see note 219 below. By the Southern Buddhists Kālidāsa is placed in the sixth century, Knighton, *Hist. of Ceylon*, 105; *Z D M G*, xii. 730. With modern astronomers, the idea of a triad of authors of this name is so fixed, that they even employ the term Kālidāsa to denote the number 3, see *Z D M G*, xii. 713.

²¹² The date of Śrī Harsha, of whom Dhāvaka is stated in the *Kāvya-prakāśa* to have been the protégé—Kashmir is not here in question—has since been fixed by Hall (Introd. to the *Vāsavadattā*) for the seventh century, rather Hall, moreover, questions the existence of Dhāvaka altogether (p. 17), and is of opinion that he "never enjoyed any more substantial existence than that of a various reading."—This conjecture of Hall's as to the name of the author of the *Ratnāvalī*, in which Bühler also concurred, has since been brilliantly verified. According to Bühler's letter from Śrinagara (publ. in *L St*, xiv. 402 ff.), all the Kashmir MSS. of the *Kāvya-prakāśa* read, in the passage in question, *Bāra*, not *Dhāvaka*, the latter name being altogether unknown to the Pandits there. "As Maṇmadā was a native of Kashmir, this reading is undoubtedly the correct one."—Comp. note 218 below.

true, have been more Dhavakas than one, another MS, moreover, reads Bhasaka,²¹³ and besides, these introductions are possibly, in part, later additions. In the case of the *Mricchhakati* at least, this would appear to be certain, as the poet's own death is there intimated.* This last-mentioned drama, the *Mricchhakati*—whose author, Śūdraka, is, according to Wilson, placed by tradition prior to Vikramaditya²¹⁴ (i.e. the same Vikrama at whose court the 'nine gems' flourished?)—cannot in any case have been written before the second century A.D. For it makes use of the word *nānaka* as the name of a coin,† and this term, according to Wilson (*Ariana Antiqua*, p. 364), is borrowed from the coins of Kanerki, a king who, by the evidence of these coins, is proved to have reigned until about the year 40 A.D. (Lassen, *I AK*, II 413). But a date long subsequent to this will have to be assigned to the *Mricchhakati*, since the vernacular dialects it introduces appear in a most barbarous condition. Besides, we meet with the very same flourishing state of Buddhism which is here revealed in one of the dramas of Bhavabhūti, a poet whose date is fixed with tolerable certainty for the eighth century A.D. The *Ramāyana* and the war-part of the *Maha-Bharata* must, to judge from the use

²¹³ The passage exhibits a great number of various readings, see Haag, *Zur Texteskritik u. Erklärung von Kālidāsa's Mālatīkāgnimitra* (1872), pp. 7, 8. Hall, l. c., prefers the readings *Bhāsaka Rāmula* and *Saumilla*, Haag, on the contrary *Bhāsa Saumilla*, *Kāmpūtra*. In Bāṇa's *Harsha charita*, Introd., v. 15 *Bhāsa* is lauded on account of his dramas; indeed, his name is even put before that of Kālidāsa.

* Unless Śūdraka rāja, the reputed author, simply was the patron of the poet? It is quite a common thing in India for the actual author to substitute the name of his patron for his own.

²¹⁴ In a prophetic chapter of the *Skanda Purāṇa*, for instance, he is placed in the year *Kali* 3290 (i.e. A.D. 189), but at the same time only twenty years before the Nandas

whom Chāṇakya is to destroy. To Vikramaditya, on the other hand, is assigned the date *Kali* 4000 i.e. A.D. 899 (?), see the text in Śiva-raṇandra Vidyāsāgara's *Marriage of Hindoo Widows*, p. 63 (Calc. 1856) and in my Essay on the *Ramāyana*, p. 43.

† According to the *Vāya kosha*, quoted by Mahidhara to *Vāy Sarnh* 25, 9 it is a synonym of *śūpa* (= rupee ?). Yājñavalkya (see Stenzler, Introd., p. 21.) and Vṛiddha Gautama (see Dattaka *Mīmāṃsā*, p. 34) are also acquainted with *nānaka* in the sense of 'coin.' [Both Lassen, *I AK*, II 575, and Müller, *A S L*, p. 331 dispute the conclusions drawn from the occurrence of the word *nānaka*. But I cannot be persuaded of the cogency of their objections.]

made of their heroes in the *Mricchakatī*, already have been favourite reading at the time when it was composed, while, on the other hand, from the absence of allusion to the chief figures of the present Purāṇas, we may perhaps infer with Wilson that these works were not yet in existence. This latter inference, however, is in so far doubtful as the legends dealt with in these younger Purāṇas were probably, to a large extent, already contained in the older works of the same name*. The two remaining dramas of Bhavabhūti, and the whole herd of the later dramatic literature, relate to the heroic tradition of the Rāmāyana and Mahā-Bharata, or else to the history of Krishna, and the later the pieces are the more do they resemble the so-called 'mysteries' of the Middle Ages. The comedies, which, together with a few other pieces, move in the sphere of civil life, form of course an exception to this. A peculiar class of dramas are the philosophical ones, in which abstractions and systems appear as the *dramatis personæ*. One very special peculiarity of the Hindū drama is that women, and persons of inferior rank, station, or caste, are introduced as speaking, not in Sanskrit, but in the popular dialects. This feature is of great importance²¹⁵ for the criticism of the individual pieces, the conclusions resulting from it have already been adverted to in the course of the discussion.

* Besides, the slaying of Śumbha and Niśumbha by Devī, which forms the subject of the Devī Māhātmya, v.-x., in the Mārkaṇḍeya-Purāṇa, is referred to in the *Mricchakatī*, p. 105 22 (ed. Stenzler).—Whether *śūd* 104 18, *Karujaka* is to be referred to the jekal of this name in the Pañchalantra is uncertain.—At page 126 9 Stenzler reads *gallalla*, but Wilson (*Hindu Theatre*, I. 134) reads *malika*, and considers it not impossible that by it we have to understand the Arabic *malikī*.—In regard to the state of manners depicted, the *Mricchakatī* is closely related to the *Dasa-kumārā*, although the latter work, written in the eleventh century [rather in the 12th, see below, p. 213], belongs

certainly to a later stage. Ought the Śūdraka who is mentioned in this work, p. 118, ed. Wilson, to be identified, perhaps, with the reputed author of the *Mricchakatī*?

²¹⁵ For example, from the relation in which the Prākṛit of the several existing recensions of the *Śakuntalā* stands to the rules of the Prākṛit grammarian Vararuchi, Pischel has drawn special arguments in support of the view advocated by him in conjunction with Stenzler, that of these recensions the Bengālī one is the most ancient, see Kuhn's *Beiträge zur veyl. Sprachforsch.* viii. 129 ff. (1874) and my observations on the subject in *J. St.* xiv. 35 ff.

From the foregoing exposition it appears that the drama meets us in an already finished form, and with its best productions. In almost all the prologues, too, the several works are represented as new, in contradistinction to the pieces of former poets, but of these pieces, that is, of the early beginnings of dramatic poetry, not the smallest remnant has been preserved.²¹⁶ Consequently the conjecture that it may possibly have been the representation of Greek dramas at the courts of the Grecian kings in Bactria, in the Panjáb, and in Gujarat (for so far did Greek supremacy for a time extend), which awakened the Hindú faculty of imitation, and so gave birth to the Indian drama, does not in the meantime admit of direct verification. But its historical possibility, at any rate, is undeniable,²¹⁷ especially as the older dramas nearly all belong to the west of India. No internal connection, however, with the Greek drama exists.²¹⁸ The fact, again, that no dramas are found either

²¹⁶ See Cowell in *I Str.*, v. 475, and as to the *Kansa vadha* and *Vali bandha*, the note on p. 198 above.

²¹⁷ Cf. the Introduction to my translation of the *Málaviká*, p. xlvii, and the remarks on *Yatana* in *2 D M G*, xiv. 269; also *I Str.*, xiii. 492.

²¹⁸ The leading work on the Indian dramas is still Wilson's *Select Specimens of the Theatre of the Hindus*, 1835¹, 1837.² The number of dramas that have been published in India is already very considerable, and is constantly being increased. Foremost amongst them still remain—the *Mrichhakatika* of Śūdraka, the three dramas of Kālidāsa (*Sakuntalā*, *Urvaśī*, and *Málavikā*), Bhavabhūta's three (*Málavī-mādhava*, *Mahā-vīra-charitra*, and *Uttara-rāma-charitra*),—the *Ratnavali* of King Śrī Harṣadeva, composed, according to Wilson's view, in the twelfth century and that not by the king himself, but by the poet Dhāvaka, who lived at his court, but according to Hall, by the poet Bāna in the beginning of the seventh century, see Hall, Introduction to the *Vāsavadattā*, p. 138. (cf. note 212 above), *I Str.*, i.

356), *Lit. Cent. Bl.*, 1872, p. 614,—the *Nāgdnanda*, a Buddhistic sensational piece ascribed to the same royal author, but considered by Cowell to belong to Dhāvaka (see, however, my notice of Boyd's translation in *Lit. C B*, 1872, p. 615)—the *Vent-samhāra* of Bhaṭṭa nāriyapa, a piece pervaded by the colouring of the Kṛishna sect, written, according to Grill, who edited it in 1871, in the sixth, and in any case earlier than the tenth century (see *Lit. C B*, 1872, p. 612)—the *Vuddha-kīlābhāṣya* of Rāja-Sekhara, probably prior to the tenth century (see *I Str.*, i. 313),—*Mudrā-rākṣasa* of Viśākha-datta, a piece of political intrigue, of about the twelfth century and lastly the *Prabodha-chandrodaya* of Kṛishnamisra, which dates, according to Goldstucker, from the end of the same century.—Two of Kālidāsa's dramas, the *Sakuntalā* and *Urvaśī*, are each extant in several recensions evidently in consequence of their having enjoyed a very special popularity. Since the appearance of Püschel's pamphlet, *De Kālidāsa Sakuntalā Recensionibus* (Breslau,

in the literature of the Hindûs, who emigrated to the island of Java about the year 500 A.D. (and thence subsequently to Bali), or among the Tibetan translations, is perhaps to be explained, in the former case, by the circumstance that the emigration took place from the east coast of India,* where dramatic literature may not as yet have been specially cultivated (?). But in the case of the Tibetans the fact is more surprising, as the *Meghadûta* of Kâlidâsa and other similar works are found among their translations.

The Lyrical branch of Sanskrit poetry divides itself, according to its subject, into the Religious and the Erotic Lyric. With respect to the former, we have already seen, when treating of the *Atharva-Samhita*, that the hymns of this collection are no longer the expression of direct religious emotion, but are rather to be looked upon as the utterance of superstitious terror and uneasy apprehension, and that in part they bear the direct character of magic spells and incantations. This same character is found faithfully preserved in the later religious lyrics, throughout the Epic, the *Parânas*, and the *Upanishads*, wherever prayers of the sort occur, and it has finally, within the last few centuries, found its classical expression in the *Tantra* literature. It is in particular by the heaping up of titles under which the several deities are invoked that their favour is thought to be won, and the 'thousand-name-prayers' form quite a special class by themselves. To this category belong also the prayers in amulet-form, to which a prodigious virtue is ascribed, and which enjoy the very highest repute even in the present day. Besides these, we also meet with prayers, to *Śiva* † especially, which

1870), in which he contends, with great confidence, for the greater authenticity of the so-called Bengali recension, the questions connected herewith have entered upon a new stage. See a full discussion of this topic in *I St.*, xiv 161 ff. To Pischel we are also indebted for our knowledge of the Dekhan recension of the *Urvasi*: it appeared in the *Monatsber der Berl Acad.*, 1875, pp 609-670.

* Yet the later emigrants might have taken some with them! (In

this Kavi literature, moreover, we have actually extant, in the *Smara-dahana*, a subsequent version of the *Kumâra-sambhava*, and in the *Sumana-santaka* (f) a similar version of the *Raghu vaṇśa*, i.e., works which, in their originals at least, bear the name of Kâlidâsa, see *I St.*, iv 133-141.] Do the well known Javanese puppet shows owe their origin to the Indian drama?

† Whose worship appears, in the main, to have exercised the most favourable influence upon his followers.

for religious fervour and childlike trust will bear comparison with the best hymns of the Christian Church, though, it must be admitted, their number is very small

The Erotic Lyric commences, for us, with certain of the poems attributed to Kalidāsa. One of these, the *Megha-dūta*, belongs at all events to a period²¹⁹ when the temple worship of Śiva Mahākāla at Ujjayinī was in its prime, as was still the case at the time of the first Muhammadan conquerors. Together with other matter of a like sort, it has been admitted, and under Kālidāsa's name, into the Tibetan Tāndjur,* from which, however, no chronological deduction can be drawn, as the date of the final completion of this compilation is unknown. The subject of the *Megha-dūta* is a message which an exile sends by a cloud to his distant love, together with the description of the route the cloud-messenger is to take—a form of exposition which has been imitated in a considerable number of similar poems. A peculiar class is composed of the sentences of Bhartṛihari,

whereas it is the worship of Kṛṣṇa that has chiefly countenanced and furthered the moral degradation of the Hindūs.

²¹⁹ A very definite chronological detail would be furnished by v. 14, provided Mallinātha's assertion is warranted, to the effect that this verse is to be taken in a double sense, i.e. as referring at the same time to Dinnāga, a violent opponent of Kālidāsa. For in that case we should in all probability have to understand by Dinnāga the well known Buddhist disputant of this name, who lived somewhere about the sixth century, see my discussion of this point in *Z. D. M. G.*, xxii. 726 ff.

* Considering the scarcity of the *Asiatic Researches*, I here give Osmar Korn's account of the Tāndjur, contained in vol. xi, 1856, in some detail. "The *Batan Hgyur* is a compilation in Tibetan of all sorts of literary works" (in all some 3900), "written mostly by ancient Indian Pandits and some learned Tibetans in the first centuries after the introduction of Buddhism into Tibet, commencing with the seventh century of our era. The whole makes

225 volumes. It is divided into the Rgyud and the Mdo (Mantra and Sūtra classes, in Sanskrit). The Rgyud, mostly on tantric rituals and ceremonies, makes 87 volumes. The Mdo, on science and literature, occupies 136 volumes. One separate volume contains (58) hymns or praises on several deities or saints, and one volume is the index for the whole.—The Rgyud contains 2640 treatises of different sizes they treat in general of the rituals and ceremonies of the mystical doctrine of the Buddhists, interspersed with many instructions, hymns, prayers, and incantations.—The Mdo treats in general of science and literature in the following order: theology, philosophy" (the two alone make 94 volumes), "logic or dialectic, philology or grammar, rhetoric, poetry, prosody, synonymics, astronomy, astrology, medicine and ethics some hints to the mechanical arts and histories." See further, in particular, Anton Schnefner's paper, *Ueber die logischen und grammatischen Werke im Tāndjur*, in the Bulletin of the St. Petersburg Academy (read 3d September 1847)

Amaru, &c, which merely portray isolated situations, without any connection as a whole. A favourite topic is the story of the loves of Krishna and the shepherdesses, the playmates of his youth. It has already been remarked that the later Kavyas are to be ranked with the erotic poems rather than with the epic. In general, this love-poetry is of the most unbridled and extravagantly sensual description, yet examples of deep and truly romantic tenderness of feeling are not wanting. It is remarkable that, in regard to some of these poems, we encounter the same phenomenon as in the case of the Song of Solomon—a mystical interpretation is put upon them, and in one instance at least, the Gita-Govinda of Jayadeva,^{219a} such a mystical reference appears really to have been intended by the poet, however incompatible this may at first sight seem with the particularly wanton exuberance of fancy which is here displayed.

Of the Ethico-Didactic Poetry—the so-called *Nīti Śāstras*—but little has survived in a complete form (some pieces also in the Tibetan Tandjur), no doubt because the great epic, the Mahā-Bhārata, in consequence of the character of universality which was gradually stamped upon it, is itself to be regarded as such a Nīti Śāstra. Still, relics enough of the aphoristic ethical poetry have been preserved to enable us to judge that it was a very favourite form, and achieved very excellent results.²²⁰ Closely allied

^{219a} Acc to Bubler (letter Sep 1875), Jayadeva, who does not appear in the *Sarav kashubha* flourished under king Lakshmanasena of Gauda, of whom there is extant an inscription of the year 1116 and whose era, still current in Mithila, begins, acc to *Ind Ant* iv 300 in A D 1170.

²²⁰ See Böhtlingk's critical edition of these aphorisms, *Indische Sprüche* 3 vols., 1863-65 (with 5119 vv.), 2d edition, 1870-73 (with 7013 vv.), and Aufrecht's analysis, in the *Z D M G*, xlvii. 1 ff (1873), of the *Sārṅgadhyāya Paddhati*, of the fourteenth century,—an anthology of about 6000 vv culled from 264 different authors and works. Compare also Joh Klatt, *De Trecentis Clodna Iyae Sententis* (1873) and Dr John

Muir's *Religious and Moral Sentiments from Sanskrit Writers* (1875). Regarding an anthology which, both in extent and antiquity, surpasses that of Sārṅgadhyāya, viz., the *Saduktī karmadrita* of Śrīdharadīpa, compiled Solo 1127 (A D 1205) and comprising quotations from 446 poets see the latest number of *Raj Lalā* *Pratya* Notices in 134 149. The statement at the close of the work respecting the era of king Lakshmanasena in whose service the poet's father was, is both in itself obscure and does not well harmonise with our other information on the point. On account of the numerous examples it quotes we may also here mention the *Saravati kashubharaṇa*, a treatise on poetics attributed to king Bhoma-deva, and therefore

to it is the literature of the 'Beast-Fable,' which has a very special interest for us, as it forms a substantial link of connection with the West. We have already pointed out that the oldest animal-fables known to us at present occur in the Chhandogyaopaniṣad. Nor are these at all limited there to the representation of the gods as assuming the forms of animals, and in this shape associating with men, of which we have even earlier illustrations,* but animals are themselves introduced as the speakers and actors. In Pāṇini's time, complete cycles of fables may possibly have already existed, but this is by no means certain as yet†. The oldest fables, out of India, are those of Babrius, for some of which at least the Indian original may be pointed out‡. But the most ancient book

belonging probably to the eleventh century, see on it Aufrecht, *Catalagus*, pp. 208, 209.—To this class also belongs, though its contents are almost entirely erotic, the Prākṛit anthology of Hāla, consisting properly of only 700 verses (whence its name *Sapta śataśa*) which, however, by successive recensions have grown to 1100–1200. It was the prototype of the *Sapta śatī* of Govardhana, a work of about the twelfth century, which in its turn seems to have served as the model for the *Satta śatī* of the Hindi poet Bābri Lal, see my Essay on the *Sapta śataśa* of Hāla (1870), pp. 9, 12, and *Z. D. M. G.* xxviii 345 ff (1874) and also Garrez in the *Journ. Asiat.*, August 1872, p. 197 ff.

* For instance the story of Manu and the fish, Indra's metamorphosis into the birds *marīkaśa* and *kapitthaśa*, his appearance in the form of a ram, &c. In the Rik the sun is frequently compared to a vulture or falcon hovering in the air.

† The words cited in support of this are not Pāṇini's own, but his scholar's (see p. 225). [But, at all events, they occur directly in the *Mahābhāṣya*, see *I. St.* xiii 486.]

‡ In my paper, *Ueber den Zusammenhang indischer Fabeln mit*

griechischen (*I. St.* iii 327 ff.) as the result of special investigations bearing upon A. Wagerer's Essay on the subject (1853), I arrived at exactly the opposite conclusion, for in nearly every instance where a Greek fable was compared with the corresponding Indian one, the marks of originality appeared to me to belong to the former. In all probability the Buddhists were here the special medium of communication, since it is upon their popular form of literary exposition that the Indian fable and fairy tale literature is especially based. Otto Keller, it is true, in his tract, *Ueber die Geschichte der griech. Fabel* (1862), maintains, in opposition to my view, the Indian origin of the fables common to India and Greece, and suggests an ancient Assyrian channel of communication. His main argument for their Indian origin is derived from the circumstance that the relation existing in Greek fable between the fox and the lion has no real basis in the nature of the two animals, whereas the jackal does, as a matter of fact, stand to the lion in the relation portrayed in Indian fable. But are jackals then, only found in India, and not also in countries inhabited by Semitic peoples? And is not the Greek animal fable precisely

of fables extant is the *Pañcha-tantra*. The original text of this work has, it is true, undergone great alteration and expansion, and cannot now be restored with certainty, but its existence in the sixth century A.D. is an ascertained fact, as it was then, by command of the celebrated Sassanian king Nûshirvan (reg 531-579), translated into Pahlavi. From this translation, as is well known, subsequent versions into almost all the languages of Asia Minor and Europe have been derived.²²² The recension of the extant text seems to have taken place in the Dekhan,²²³ while the epitome of it known as the *Hito-padeśa* was probably drawn up at Pahlbothra, on the Ganges. The form of the Hindû collections of fables is a peculiar one, and is therefore everywhere easily recognisable, the leading incident which is narrated invariably forming a framework within which stories of the most diverse description are set.*—Allied to the fables are the

a Semitic growth? That the Indians should turn the fox of the Greek fable back again into the jackal necessarily followed from the very nature of the case. The actual state of things, namely, that the jackal prowls about after the lion, had indeed early attracted their attention, see e.g., *Rik*, x. 28. 4, but there is no evidence at all that in the older period the knowledge was turned to the use to which it is put in the fable: the only characteristics mentioned of the jackal being its howling, its devouring of carrion, and its enmity to the dog. (In *Satap*, xii. 5. 2. 5, the jackal is, it is true, associated with the word *śvayadha*, and this is certainly noteworthy, but here the term simply signifies 'burnt' or 'putrid'.) Keller's views as to the high antiquity of the Indian authors he cites are unfounded.

²²² See on this Benfey's translation (1859) of the *Pañcha-tantra*, which follows Kosegarten's edition of the text (1848). Here there is a full exposition of the whole subject of the later diffusion of the materials of Indian fable throughout the West. Kielhorn and Bühler have published a new edition of the text

in the *Bombay Sanskrit Series* (1863 ff).

²²³ From Benfey's researches, it appears that, in this recension, the original text, which presumably rested on a Buddhist basis underwent very important changes, so that, curiously enough, a German translation made in the last quarter of the fifteenth century from a Latin rendering, which in its turn was based upon a Hebrew version, represents the ancient text more faithfully than its existing Sanskrit form does. Of this, for the rest, two or more other recensions are extant, see *J. Str.*, ii. 166. For the 14th chap. of the *Kalila wa Dismna*, no Indian original had been known to exist, but quite recently a Tibetan translation of this original has been discovered by Anton Schiefner, see his *Ekharata Responso*, St. Petersburg 1875. On a newly discovered ancient Syrian translation of the groundwork of the *Pañcha-tantra*, made, it is supposed, either from the Pahlavi or from the Sanskrit itself, see Benfey in the *Augsbürger Allg. Zeit.* for July 12, 1871.

* Precisely the same thing takes place in the *Mahā Bhārata* also.

Fairy Tales and Romances,²²⁴ in which the luxuriant fancy of the Hindús has in the most wonderful degree put forth all its peculiar grace and charm. These too share with the fables the characteristic form of setting just referred to, and thereby, as well as by numerous points of detail, they are sufficiently marked out as the original source of most of the Arabian, Persian, and Western fairy tales and stories, although, in the meantime, very few of the corresponding Indian texts themselves can be pointed out.

As regards the last branch of Indian poetry, namely, Geography and History, it is characteristic enough that the latter can only fittingly be considered as a branch of poetry, and that not merely on account of its form—for the poetic form belongs to science also—but on account of its subject-matter as well, and the method in which this is handled. We might perhaps have introduced it as a division of the epic poetry, but it is preferable to keep the two distinct, since the works of the class now in question studiously avoid all matter of a purely mythical description. We have already remarked that the old Puranas contained historical portions, which, in the existing Puranas, are confined to the mere nomenclature of dynasties and kings, and that here they clash violently, not only with one another, but with chronology generally. We meet with the same discrepancies in all works of the class we are now considering and especially in its leading representative, Kālhana's *Rāja-tarāṅginī*, or history of Kāshmir, which belongs to the twelfth century A D. Here, it is

²²⁴ Here, before all, is to be mentioned Somadeva's *Kaṭhā sarit-saṅgāra*, of the twelfth century, edited by Hermann Brockhaus (1839-66). Of the *Vikāt kaṭhā* of Guṇāditya, belonging to about the sixth century—a work which is supposed to have been written in the *Pārsīcī bhāṣā* and which is the basis of the work of Somadeva,—a recast by Kehe-mamkara has recently been discovered by Burnell and Bühler, see *Ind. Antiq.* 1. 302 ff. (Kehe-mamkara is also called Kehe-mendra, according to Bühler (letter from

Kāshmir, pub. in *I. St.*, xiv. 402 ff.) he lived under king Ananta (1028-1080) and wrote 1030-1040.—The *Dakṣa kumāra charita* of Dandin, belonging to about the sixth century, was edited by Wilson in 1846 and by Bühler in 1873. Subandhu's *Vāsara-dattā* (seventh century?) was edited by Hall, with an excellent critical introduction in 1859 (*Bibl. Ind.*). Bāna's *Kadambari*, of about the same date, appeared at Calcutta in 1850. For an account of these last three works see my *I. St.*, 1. 303-386.

true, we have to do with something more than mere bald data, but then, as a set-off to this, we have also to do with a poet, one who is more poet than historian, and who, for the rest, appeals to a host of predecessors. It is only where the authors of these works treat of contemporary subjects that their statements possess a decided value, though, of course, precisely with respect to these, their judgment is in the highest degree biased. But exceptions likewise appear to exist, and in particular, in some princely houses, family records, kept by the domestic priests, appear to have been preserved, which, in the main,* seem to be passably trustworthy²²⁵.—As for Geography, we repeatedly

* Only the family pedigree must not enter into the question, for these genealogical tables go back almost regularly to the heroic families of the epic.

²²⁵ Certain statements in the astrological treatise *Gārgi Saṃhitā* cap. *Yuga Purāṇa*, in which the relations of the Yavanas with India are touched upon (see Kern, *Prof. to Brihat Saṃhitā*, p. 33 ff.), appear to have a real historical significance. Bāṇa's *Harsa charita* too, seems to be a work embodying some good information. See Hall, *Prof. to the Vārāṇasī dattā*, p. 12 ff. (1859). And the same remark applies to the *Vikramānanda charita* by Bilhana of Kashmir, in 18 *śargas* composed about A.D. 1085, just edited with a very valuable introduction by Bühler. This work supplies most important and authentic information, not only regarding the poet's native country and the chief cities of India visited by him in the course of prolonged travels, but also as to the history of the Chālukya dynasty whose then representative, Irīḍhuvana malla, the work is intended to exalt. In Bühler's opinion, we may hope for some further accession to our historical knowledge from the still existing libraries of the Jamas and, I might add, from their special literature also, which is peculiarly rich in legendary works (*charita*). The *Satrapya ya mādhyāya* of Dha-

ndavara, in 14 *śargas*, composed in Valabhi, under king Śūdditya, at the end of the sixth century, yields, it is true, but scant historical material, and consists for the most part merely of popular tales and legends, see my paper on it (1858), p. 12 ff. (Bühler, l. c., p. 18, places this work as late as the thirteenth century; similarly, Lassen, *J. A. S.*, iv 76, but see my Essay on the Bhagavati, p. 369). Still, a great variety of information has been preserved by the Jīnas, which deserves attention, for example, respecting the ancient kings Vikramārka and Śhrivāhana, though, to be sure, they, too have become almost wholly mythical figures. The *Vira charita* of Ananta, lately analysed by H. Jacobs in *J. St.*, xiv 97 ff., describes the feuds between the descendants of these two kings, introducing a third legendary personage, Śūdraka, who, aided by the Mīlava king, the son of Vikramārka, succeeds in making the son of Śhrivāhana from Prasthādhina. It is written in a fresh and graphic style, but, to all appearance, it has only a very slight really historical nucleus, indeed it expressly claims to be an imitation of the Rāmāyana! The *Śrīdharmadattasūkt* too a work extant in several recensions, of which one, the *Vikrama charita* (see above, p. 200), is attributed to Vararuchi, is almost solely, as the *Vedika* par-

find, in the various Puranas, jejune enumerations of mountains, rivers, peoples, and the like²²⁵. But modern works, also upon this subject are quoted these, however, are known only by name—A leading source, besides, for history and geography, is supplied by the exceedingly numerous inscriptions and grants,* which, indeed, being often of very considerable extent, might almost pass as a special branch of the literature. They are usually drawn up in prose, though mostly with an admixture of verse. Of coins the number is comparatively small yet they have furnished surprisingly rich information regarding a period previously quite unknown in its details, the period of the Grecian kings of Bactria.²²⁷

From this general view of Sanskrit poetry, we now turn to the second division of Sanskrit literature, to the works of Science and Art

chaturvidya exclusively, made up of matter of the fairy tale description. The stories in the *Bhoga-prabandha* of king Bhora and his court of poets are mere fanciful inventions. —Bühler, in his letter from Kashmir (*J St.*, xiv 404, 405) states that he has now also discovered the *Adi-mata* which was used by Kalhana, as also the *Taramgrāṇi* of Kshemendra and Helāṇḍa, for the *Rāja-taramgrāṇi* itself there is thus the prospect of important corrections.

²²⁵ Of special interest in this regard are the sections styled *Kurvaśāḍga* in the astrological texts see Kern *Pref. to Brāh. Samā* p. 12 and in *J St.*, i 200 ff. Cunningham's otherwise most meritorious work, *Ancient Geography of India* (1871) has unfortunately taken no account of these.

* On metal plates first men-

tioned in Yājñavalkya's law book and in the *Pañcha-tantra* in Manus Code they are not yet known. (See the special accounts given of these in Burnell's *Elem. of S. Ind. Palaeog.*, p. 63 ff.)

²²⁷ Wilson's *Ariana Antiqua* (1841) and Lassen's *Indische Alterthums-kunde* (1847-61) still form the chief mine of information and basis of research in the field of Indian history. In the department of Numismatics and Inscriptions Burgess, Burnell, Cunningham, Dowson, Egeling, Ferguson, Edw. Thomas Vaux, Bhandarkar, and Rājendra Lal Mitra have of late done eminent service. In connection with the so-called cave inscriptions the names of Bhāu Dājī, Bird Stevenson E. W. and A. A. West, Westergaard, and J. Wilson, amongst others, may be mentioned.

We give the precedence to the Science of Language,²² and take Grammar first.

We have already had frequent occasion to allude to the early beginnings and gradual development of grammatical science. It grew up in connection with the study and recitation of the Vedic texts, and those works which were specially devoted to it, protected by the sacredness of their subject, have, in part, survived. But, on the other hand, we have no records of the earlier stages of that grammatical study which was directed to and embraced the entire range of the language,* and we pass at once into the magnificent edifice which bears the name of Panini as its architect, and which justly commands the wonder and admiration of every one who enters.† Panini's grammar is distinguished above all similar works of other countries, partly by its thoroughly exhaustive investigation of the roots of the language, and the formation of words, partly by its sharp precision of expression, which indicates with an enigmatical succinctness whether forms come under the same or different rules. This is rendered possible by the employment of an algebraic terminology of arbitrary contrivance, the several parts of which stand to each other in the closest harmony, and which, by the very fact of its sufficing for all the phenomena which the language presents, bespeaks at once the marvellous ingenuity of its inventor, and his profound penetration of the entire material of the language. It is not, indeed, to be assumed that Panini was altogether the inventor of this method, for, in the first place, he directly presupposes, for example, a collection of primary affixes (*Un-ādī*), and, in the second place, for various grammatical elements there occur in his work two sets of technical terms, the one of which is peculiar to himself, while the other, as testified by his

²² The general assertion in the *Mahābhāṣya* to 1.1.44^a (*chāṇ devat sūtrāni śāstrāni*) which ascribes Vedic usage to *Sūtras* in general, is explained by *Kuṣiṭṭha* in the sense that, not the *śākhikā sūtrāni* for example, but only the *vyākaraṇa sūtrāni* are here meant, since these latter belong to the Veda
anuga see J. St., xii 453

* Only in *Yāska's Nirukti* are beginnings of the kind preserved, yet here etymology and the invention of roots and of the formation of words are still in a very crude stage

† *Eg.* of *Père Pons* so long ago as 1753, in the *Lettres Éléphantines*, 26 22; (*Luria*)

commentators, is taken from the Eastern grammarians.² But at any rate, it seems to have been he who generalised the method, and extended it to the entire stock of the language. Of those of his predecessors whom he mentions directly by name, and whose names recur in part in Yāska's Nirukti, the Prātiśākhya Sūtras, or the Āraṇyakas some may possibly have worked before him in this field, in particular, Śakāṭāyana perhaps, whose grammar is supposed (Wilson, *Mack Coll.*, I. 160) to be still in existence, although nothing definite is known about it.³

The question now arises, When did Panini live? Bohtlingk, to whom we owe an excellent edition of the grammar, has attempted to fix his date for the middle of the fourth century B.C., but the attempt seems to be a failure. Of the reasons adduced, only one has any approach to plausibility, which is to the effect that in the Kathā-saritsāgarī, a collection of popular tales belonging to the twelfth century, Panini is stated to have been the disciple of one Varsha, who lived at Pataliputra in the reign of Nanda, the father of Chandragupta (Ξανδοκυπτος). But not only is the authority of such a work extremely questionable in reference to a period fifteen centuries earlier, the assertion is, besides, directly contradicted, both as to time and place, by a statement of the Buddhist Hiuan Tshang, who travelled through India in the first half of the seventh century. For Hiuan Tshang, as reported by Remaud (*Mém. sur l'Inde*, p. 88), speaks of a double existence of Panini, the earlier one belonging to mythical times, while the second is put by him 500 years after Buddha's

* See Bohtlingk in the Introduction to his *Pāṇini*, p. xii, and in his tract, *Ueber den Accent im Sanskrit*, p. 65.

² In Benfey's *Orient und Occident*, II. 691-706 (1863), and in 181, 182 (1864) G. Buhler has given an account of a commentary (*chintā mōṇi vṛtti*) on the *Śabdānuśāsana* of Śakāṭāyana according to which (p. 703) Pāṇini's work would appear to be simply 'an improved completed and in part remodelled edition of that of Śakāṭāyana'. The author of this commentary Yāskaharman,

himself a Jaina in his introduction describes Śakāṭāyana also as such—namely, as 'mahā-brāhmaṇa-saṃgha-dhīpati', see also *I. St.* xiii. 396, 397. In Burnell's opinion, *Varsha Brāhmaṇa*, p. xli, many of Śakāṭāyana's rules are on the contrary, based upon Pāṇini or even on the *Yājñalkas*, nay, even on the further interpretations in the *Mahābhāṣya*. Might not these contradictions be explained by supposing that the existing form of the work combines both old and new constituents?

Hsuan Tshang's assertion, no credit whatever need at present be attached to the statement in the *Rāja-tarāṅginī*. If Panini did not really flourish until 100 years after Kanishka, i.e. A.D. 140,²²¹ it is self-evident that the commentary upon his work cannot have been in existence, and still less have been introduced into Kashmir, under Abhimanyu, Kanishka's immediate successor!—But, apart altogether from the foregoing considerations, we have in Panini's work itself, a very weighty argument which goes to show that the date to be assigned to him can by no means be so early as Böhtlingk supposes (about B.C. 350). For in it Panini once mentions the Yavanas, i.e. 'Idoers, Greeks,* and explains the formation of the word *yavanāni*

²²¹ But no such inference is deducible from Hsuan Tshang's account, now that we are in possession of its exact tenor (see note 230 above): the statement of the *Rāja-tarāṅginī* is thus in no way impugned by it.

* Lassen (*J. A. K.*, i. 729) asserts that the most ancient meaning of the word *yavana* was probably 'Arabia,' because incense, which came from Arabia, was termed *yavana* but this assertion is distinctly erroneous. So far as we know at present, this latter term first occurs in the *Amara kośa*, and there along with *suruṣāka*, which can scarcely be a very ancient word. It may consequently either date from the time of the commercial intercourse of the Indians with Arabia shortly before Muhammad, or even with the Mohammedan Arabs, or else—like *yavanakāśa*, 'tin' [Hemach., 1041, according to Böhtlingk Fien, 'lead,' not 'tin'] and *yavana-prīya*, 'pepper,' the chief articles of traffic with the Greeks of Alexandria—it may possibly have been named, not from the Arabs, but from the Greeks, who brought incense as well as tin and pepper from India (Lassen, *J. A. K.*, 286 n).¹ Wherever we find the Yavanas mentioned in the epic, or other similar ancient writings, only the Greeks can be meant. (The almost constant association of them

with the Kambojas, Śakas, &c., is conclusive as to this, see *J. Str.*, ii. 321, *J. St.*, iii. 371. The name Yavana was then in course of time transferred to the political successors of the Greeks in the empire of Western India, that is, to the Indo-Scythians themselves, to the Persians (Pārsakas, whose women, for example, are termed *Yavatis* by Kālidāsa in *Raghuv.* iv. 61), and, lastly, to the Arabs or Moslems, see *J. St.*, iii. 308. Recently, it is true, Rājendra Lal Mitra, in the *Jour. As. Soc. Beng.*, 1874, p. 246 ff., has pronounced against the view that the Greeks were originally meant by the Yavanas, but his arguments are in great part of a very curious kind. Cf. further on this point my letter in the *Ind. Antiq.*, iv. 244 ff. (1875) where, in particular, I point out that the name Yavana first became popularised in India through Alexander, i.e., through his Persian interpreters, although it may possibly have been known previously through the medium of the Indian auxiliaries who served in the army of Darius.)—There is a remarkable legend in the *Purāṇas* and the twelfth book of the *Mahā Bhārata*, of the fight of Krishna with Kṛṣṇa-Yavana, 'the Black Yavana,' so called, it would appear, in contradistinction to the (white) Yavanas? Ought we here to understand African or dark Sem

—to which, according to the *Vārttika*, the word *lyp*, 'writing,' must be supplied, and which therefore signifies 'the writing of the Yavanas.'²³²—In the *Pañcha-tantra*, Panini is said to have been killed by a lion, but, independently of the question whether the particular verse containing this allusion belongs to the original text or not, no chronological inference can be drawn from it.²³³

the races that had come into collision with the Indians? At the time of the *Dakṣa-kumāra*, the name *Kāla-Yavana* (as well as *Yavana* itself) does, in point of fact, expressly designate a seafaring people—supposed by Wilson to be the Arabs. In the legend in the *Purāṇas* and the *Mahā-Bhārata*, on the contrary, no reference to the sea is traceable, and Wilson therefore (*Vishnu Pur*, 565, 566) refers it to the Greeks, that is, those of Bactria. This view is perhaps confirmed by the circumstance that this *Kāla-Yavana* is associated with a *Gārgya*, since it is to *Gārgya*, at least, who uniformly appears as one of the earliest Indian astronomers, that a verse is ascribed, in which the *Yavanas* (here unquestionably the Greeks) are highly extolled. Possibly this is the very reason why *Gārgya* is here associated with *Kāla-Yavana*.

²³² For the different explanations that have been attempted of this word, see *I St*, v 5-8, 17 ff., Burnell, *Elem of S Ind Pal*, p 7, 93 the latter regards it as "not unlikely that *lyp* has been introduced into Indian from the Persian *lyp*. Benfey also in his *Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft* p 48 (1869), understands by *Yavanani* 'Greek writing' but he places the completion of Pāṇini's work as early as B.C. 320. In that case, he thinks Pāṇini "had already had the opportunity during six years of becoming acquainted with Greek writing in his own immediate neighbourhood without interruption Alexander having as is well known, established satrapies in India itself and in the parts adjoining

ing"—in the vicinity of the Indus, namely, near which Pāṇini's birth-place was. But to me it is very doubtful indeed that a space so short as six years should have sufficed to give rise to the employment by the Indians of a special term and affix to denote Greek writing—(which surely in the first years after Alexander's invasion can hardly have attracted their attention in so very prominent a way!)—so that the mere expression 'the Greek' directly signified 'the writing of the Greeks' and Pāṇini found himself obliged to explain the formation of the term in a special rule. "The expression could only have become so very familiar through prolonged and frequent use—a thing conceivable and natural in Pāṇini's native district, in those provinces of North Western India which were so long occupied by the Greeks. But this of course presupposes that a lengthened period had intervened since the time of Alexander"—*I St*, iv 89 (1857).

²³³ Since the above was written the question of Pāṇini's date has been frequently discussed. Max Müller first of all urged, and rightly, the real import of Hiuen Tsiang's account, as opposed to my argument. Apart from this, however, I still firmly adhere to the reasoning in the text, see *I St*, iv 87, v 2 ff. To the vague external testimony we need hardly attach much importance. Pāṇini's vocabulary itself (cf *ya-randaś*) can alone yield us certain information. And it was upon this path that Goldstucker proceeded in his *Pāṇini, his place in Sanskrit Literature* (September 1861)—a work distinguished in an eminent

Pāṇini's work has continued to be the basis of grammatical research and the standard of usage in the language down even to the present time. Owing to its frequent obscurity it was early commented upon, and—a circumstance to which there is no parallel elsewhere in the literature—some of these earliest interpretations have come down to us. At their head stand the *Paribhāṣās*, or explanations of single rules, by unknown authors, next come the *Vārttikas* (from *vṛtti*, 'explanation') of Kātyāyana,* and after these the *Mahābhāṣya* of Patanjali. With regard to the date of Kātyāyana, the statement of Hsuan Tsang, to the effect that 300 years after Buddha's death, i.e., in B.C. 240,† "*le docteur Kia to yan na*" lived at Tāmasavana in the Panjāb, is by Bohtlingk referred to this Kātyāyana, but when we remember that the same traveller assigns to Pāṇini's second existence a date so late as 500 years after Buddha, such a reference of course becomes highly precarious. Besides, the statement is in

degree by truly profound investigation of this aspect of the question as well as of the literature immediately bearing upon it. The conclusion he arrives at is that Pāṇini is older than Buddha, than the *Prātiśākhya*s, than all the Vedic texts we possess, excepting the three Samhitās of the Rik, Sāman, and Black Yajus—older than any individual author in whatever field, with the single exception of Yāska (p. 243). In May 1861, before the separate publication of this work, which had previously (Nov. 1860) appeared as the preface to Goldstücker's photo-lithographed edition of the Mānava Kalpa Sūtra, I endeavoured—and, as I believe, successfully—in a detailed rejoinder in *I St.*, v. 1-176, to rebut these various deductions, point by point. For the post-Buddhist date of Pāṇini, compare in particular the evidence adduced, pp. 136-142, which is excellently supplemented by Bühler's paper on Śikṣāyana (1863, see note 229 above). To the mention of the 'Yavanāni' has to be added a peculiar circumstance which Burnell has recently noticed

(*Mem. S. Ind. Pal.*, p. 96). The denoting of numbers by the letters of the alphabet in their order ($1=2$), to which Goldstücker (*Pāṇini*, p. 53) first drew attention, and which, according to the *Bhāṣya*, is peculiar to Pāṇini, occurs in his work only, and is "precisely similar to the Greek and Semitic notation of numerals by letters of the alphabet." If, further, the Greek accounts of the confederation of the Oḡōpōne and Mallot be correct, if, that is to say, their alliance first took place through fear of Alexander whereas they had up till then lived in constant enmity then in all probability Apollonius, and a fortiori Pāṇini also, would have to be set down as subsequent to Alexander, see *I St.*, xiii. 375 n.

Who there mentions several of these *Paribhāṣās*.

† That is, if we adopt the chronology of the Southern Buddhists, but rather, only B.C. 60, since Kanishka, whose date, as we saw, is fixed by coins for A.D. 40 is by Hsuan Tsang placed 400 years after Buddha's death.

itself an extremely indefinite one, the "docteur" in question not being described as a grammarian at all, but simply as a descendant of the Katya family²²⁴ Even admitting, however, that the reference really is to him, it would still be in conflict with the tradition—in itself, it is true, of no particular authority—of the *Katha sarit-sagara*, which not only represents Katyaiana as the contemporary of Pāṇini, but identifies him with Vararuchi, a minister of King Nanda, the father of Chandragupta (Σανδρακυπτος), according to which, of course, he must have flourished about B.C. 350 As regards the age of the *Mahābhāṣya*,²²⁵ we have seen that the assertion of the *Raja-taramgini* as to its introduction into Kashmir in the reign of Abhimanyu, the successor of Kanishka, i.e., between A.D. 40 and 65, is, for the reasons above assigned, in the meantime discredited²²⁶ For the present, therefore, we are without information as to the date of those interpretations, just as we are regarding the date of Pāṇini himself But when once they are themselves in our hands it will certainly be possible to gather from their contents, by means of the great number of words they contain, a tolerably clear image of the time when they originated,²²⁷ in the same way as we

²²⁴ It is this only that has weight, whereas no importance whatever is to be attached, as we have already seen (note 230), to the second existence of Pāṇini. On the various *hātyas*, *Kātyāyana* at the time of the *Bhāṣya* itself, for instance, see *J. St.*, xiii 399

²²⁵ The name *Patamjali* (we should expect *Pat*) is certainly somehow connected with that of the *Patanchala Kāpya* of the land of the *Madras*, who appears in the *Yājñavalkya* *kānda* of the *Satap. Br.* It occurs again (see below p. 237) as the name of the author of the *Yoga Sūtras*. *Patamjali* appears as name of one of the prior births of Buddha (No. 242 in *Westergaard's Catalogue*, p. 39). In the *Pravaraḍhyaya* § 9 (*Yajñ. Pariś.*) the *Patamjalis* are classed as belonging to the family of *Vishāṇin*—According to later accounts, by *Conardiya*, who is cited four times in the *Bhāṣya*, we have

to understand *Patamjali* himself, and the same applies to the name *Gonikāputra*, see on this *J. St.*, v 155, xiii 316, 323, 403.

²²⁶ By no means see note 231

²²⁷ On the basis of the lithographed edition of the *Mahābhāṣya*, published at Benares in 1872 by *Rājā-rāmaśāstrin* and *Bhāṣāśāstrin* with *Kaṣyapa's* commentary (of about the seventh century (?) see *J. St.*, v 167) I have attempted in *J. St.*, xiii 293–502, to sketch such an outline. The first section of the work, with *Kaṣyapa*, and *Nāgeśa's* gloss, belonging to the eighteenth century was published so long ago as 1856 by *Ballantyne*. A photo-lithographed issue of the entire *Bhāṣya*, prepared under *Goldstucker's* supervision at the expense of the Indian Government, has recently appeared in London, in 3 vols. (vol. I, the *Bhāṣya* vol. II *Bhāṣya* with *Kaṣyapa's* *Comment.*, vol. III, *Nāgeśa's*

can even now attempt, although only in broad outline, a picture of the time of Pāṇini.* With regard to the latter, the condition of the text, in a critical point of view, forms a main difficulty. A few of the Sūtras found in it are already notoriously acknowledged not to be Pāṇini's, and there is the further peculiar circumstance, that, according to the scholasts of the Calcutta edition, fully a third of the entire Sūtras are not interpreted in the *Mahābhāṣya* at all.† The question then arises whether this is merely

bhaṭṭa's Schol. on Kaṭyāya) Goldstücker, in his *Pāṇini* p. 228 ff., mainly upon the ground of the statement in the *Bhāṣya* "*arunaḥ Yavanaḥ Sāketam*," which he connects with an expedition of Menander (B.C. 144-120) against Ayodhyā, fixed the date of the composition of the work for the period of this expedition, or specially for B.C. 140-120. The objections urged by me (*I St.*, v 151) against this assumption were in the first place, materially weakened by a remark of Kern's in his Preface to the *Bṛh. Sūph.* of Vārha-mihira, p. 37, according to which the statement in the same passage of the *Bhāṣya* "*arunaḥ Yavanaḥ Mādhyamikā*" is not necessarily to be referred to the Buddhist school of this name, first founded by Nāgārjuna, but may possibly have reference to a tribe called Mādhyamika, mentioned elsewhere. In the next place, Bhandarkar, in the *Ind. Antiq.*, i. 299 ff., ii. 59 ff., attempted to prove that Patanjali wrote the particular section where he speaks in the above terms of Menander (who is assumed, on Goldstücker's authority, to be meant by 'Yavana') between A.D. 144 and 142, seeing that he there at the same time speaks of sacrifices as still being performed for Pūṣyamitra (A.D. 178-142). In my reply in *I St.*, xiii. 305 ff., I emphasised these points first, that the identity of the Yavana and Menander is by no means made out, next, that it does not at all necessarily follow from the passage in question that

Patanjali and Pūṣyamitra (this is the correct form) were contemporaries, and, lastly, that Patanjali may possibly have found these examples already current, in which case they cannot be used to prove anything with regard to him but only with regard to his predecessors—it may be, even Pāṇini himself. And although I am now disposed, in presence of Bhandarkar's further objections, to admit the historical bearing of the statement referring to Pūṣyamitra (but see Bṛhthingk's opposite view in *Z. D. M. G.*, xlix. 183 ff.), still, with respect to all the examples here in question, I must lay special stress on the possibility just mentioned, that they may belong to the class of *śrutiśāstra* illustrations (*Śūdr.*, p. 315). We must for the present rest satisfied, therefore (p. 319), with placing the date of the composition of the *Bhāṣya* between B.C. 140 and A.D. 60,—a result which, considering the wretched state of the chronology of Indian literature generally, is, despite its indefiniteness, of no mean importance.

* See *I St.*, i. 141 157. [The beginning here made came to a stand still for want of the *Mahābhāṣya*.]

† In the case of some of these, it is remarked that they are not explained here, or are not separately. Acquaintance with the *Mahābhāṣya* itself will alone yield us satisfactory information on this point. [From Aufrecht's accounts in his *Catal. Cod. Sans. Bib. Bodl.*, it appeared that of Pāṇini's 3953 rules only 1770 are directly discussed, and Gold

because these particular Sūtras are clear and intelligible of themselves, or whether we may not also here and there have to suppose cases where the Sūtras did not yet form part of the text at the time when this commentary was composed. The so-called *ganās*, or lists of words which follow one and the same rule, and of which, uniformly only the initial word is cited in the text itself, are for the present wholly without critical authenticity, and carry no weight, therefore, in reference to Panini's time. Some such lists must, of course, have been drawn up by Panini, but whether those now extant are the same is very problematical. Indeed, to some extent it is simply impossible that they can be so. Nay, such of them even as chance to be specified singly in the Mahabhashya can, strictly speaking, prove nothing save for the time of this work itself.* Here, too, another word of caution is necessary,—one which ought, indeed, to be superfluous, but unfortunately is not, as experience shows,—namely, that care must be taken not to attribute to words and examples occurring in the scholia, composed so recently as fifty years ago, of the Calcutta edition of Panini, any validity in reference to the time of Panini himself. No doubt such examples are usually derived from the Mahabhashya, but so long as this is not actually proved to be the case, we are not at liberty at once to assume it, and besides even when it is clear that they are actually borrowed from the Mahabhashya, they are good only for the time of this work itself, but not for that of Panini.²³

Moreover then showed that the Bhāṣya is not so much a commentary on Panini as rather a defence of him against the unjust attacks of Kātyāyana the author of the *vārtikas*, see *I St.* xiii 297 ff.]

* See *I St.* i 142, 143, 151 [xii 298, 302, 329].

²³ This is not quite strictly to the purpose. Max Müller was the first to point out that Panini's Sūtras were evidently from the beginning accompanied by a definite interpretation, whether oral or written, and that a considerable proportion of the examples in the Bhāṣya must have come from this source. Nay, the

Bhāṣya has itself a special name for these, such examples being styled *murdhābhāṣukta*, see *I St.* xiii 315. Unfortunately, however, we have not the slightest clue (*I St.* ii 167) to enable us to decide, in individual instances whether an example belongs to this class of *murdhā* or not.—On the other hand—as results not only from the data in the *Rāja tarāṅginī*, but also, in particular, from the statements at the close of the second book of Haria Vākyapadiya, which were first cited by Goldstücker, and have lately been published in a corrected form by Kielhorn in the *Ind. Antiq.* iii 283—

In addition to Panini's system, there grew up in course of time several other grammatical systems, having their own peculiar terminology; and grammatical literature in general attained to a most remarkably rich and extensive development.²³ The Tibetan Tandyar likewise embraces

257.—the *Bhāṣya* has undergone manifold vicissitudes of fortune, has been more than once rewritten, and arranged afresh, so that the possibility of considerable changes, additions, and interpolations cannot be denied. Strictly speaking, therefore in each individual case it remains *a priori* uncertain whether the example is to be credited to Patanjali himself, or to these subsequent remodelings of the text (or, reversely, to Patanjali's predecessors, or even to Pāṇini himself), see *J. S.*, ii. 1. 320-329, *Ind. Anz.*, iv. 247. Kielhorn, it is true, in *Ind. Anz.*, iv. 108, has protested very strongly against the view "that at some time or other the text of the *Mahābhāṣya* had been lost, that it had to be reconstructed," &c. He will only "perhaps allow a break so far as regards its traditional interpretation," while we are for the time being bound "to regard the text of the *Mahābhāṣya* as given by our MSS. to be the same as it existed about 2000 years ago." Let us, then await the arguments he has to offer in support of this; for his protest alone will hardly suffice in the face of the statements on the subject that are still preserved in the tradition itself. On three separate occasions, the epithets *vaidika*, *Uvāṣika*, *vaidika* are employed of the work. And there is the further circumstance that, according to Burnell's testimony (Pref. to *Vaidika Brh.*, p. xxi. n.), the South Indian MSS. of the text appear to vary considerably; see also Burnell's *Elem. S. Ind. Pal.*, pp. 7, 32.

²³ The *Vākyaśāstra* of Harī, the editing of which has now been undertaken by Kielhorn, connects itself specially with the *Mahā*

bhāṣya.—The *Āṣṭādhyāyī* of Vāmana, a direct commentary on Pāṇini, is at present being edited by D. C. Śāstrī in the Benares Press. According to him, it was composed in the thirteenth century, as Goṣaṅkara had already stated, whereas the date previously assigned to it, in accordance with Böhtlingk's view, was towards the eighth century, see *J. S.*, v. 67. Cappeller's introduction to *Vāmana's Āṣṭādhyāyī*, pp. vii, viii.—To Anurādhī we owe an edition (Bomb., 1875) of *Ujvaladaśa's Commentary* (of the thirteenth century or so) on the *Indi-Sūtra* which are portions (see *J. S.*, ii. 222) to be ascribed to Śāstrīśvara. And J. L. Eggeling is engaged on an edition of the *Govardana vākyāṇṭhi* of Varāha-mihira.—Of Bhāṭṭoji Dīkṣa's *Saṁskṛta-kramadī* (seventeenth century) we have now a new and good edition by Tārānīśa Vāchस्पति (Calcutta, 1874-1875).—A highly meritorious work is the edition with English version, &c., of Varāha-mihira's *Laghu-kramadī* by J. R. Ballantyne (originally published at Murzapore 1872).—Śaṅkara's *Pratīti-Sūtra* were edited by Kielhorn in 1855, and to him we also owe an excellent edition of *Harī's bhāṣya's Paribhāṣikā* &c. &c., a work of the last century (Bombay, 1868-74).—Of grammatical systems which proceed on their own lines, departing from Pāṇini, we have Yopadeva's *Mayūṭī* both of the thirteenth century in an edition, amongst others, by F. J. Schlegel (St. Petersburg, 1847) the *Siddhanta* of Anubhūti-vardyaśāstra appeared at Bombay in 1861 in a lithographed edition, the *Ādika* of Sarvagharman, with Durgadāśa's *Commentary*, is being edited by Eggeling in the *Bib. Indica* (2

a tolerable number of grammatical writings and these for the most part works that have been lost in India itself²⁴⁹

As regards Lexicography—the second branch of the science of language—we have already pointed out its first beginnings in the Nighantus, collections of synonyms, &c., for the elucidation of the Vedic texts. But these were of a practical character, and wholly confined to the Veda, the need of collections towards a dictionary of Sanskrit, being, on the contrary, more a scientific one, was naturally only awakened at a much later time. Here, too, the earliest attempts in this direction have perished, and the work of Amara sinha, the oldest of the kind that has come down to us, appeals expressly in the introduction to other Tantras, from which it was itself compiled. Its commentators also expressly mention by name as such Tantras the Trikanḍa the Utpalini, and the works of Rabhasa, Katjayana, Vyādi,* and Vararuchi, the two latter as authorities for the gender of words.

1574 it had reached to iv. 4. 50). The system of this grammar is of peculiar interest on this account, that a special connection appears to exist between it and the Pāli grammar of Kaccayana, particularly in regard to the terminology employed. According to Euhlers's letter from Kashmir (pub. in *J. S.* xiv. 402 ff.) the Kāśmirī is the special grammar of the Kāśmirīa, and was therefore frequently commented upon in the 12th–16th centuries. Of older grammatical texts he has further discovered the *Paribhāṣas* of Vyādi and Chandra, as also the *Varṇa Sūtra* and *Śabd-āṣaṣṭa-c'andras* of the latter. Likewise an *Aryaṣaṭtri* and *Uḍḍiṭa-taromāṇi* by Jayāditya (Jayāṣṭha's preceptor) and a beautiful *dhruva* MS. of the Kāśmirī. In one of these MSS. this is a revised work is ascribed to Jāmana and Jayāditya (Jayāṣṭha), whereby the earlier view as to its date again gains credit.—For a list of 'Sanskrit-Grammars,' &c. see Colebrook's *Misc. Ess.* ii. 33 ff., ed. Cowell.—It remains still to mention here Cowell's edition of the *Prāśastya* of Vararuchi

(1854–1868), further, an edition recently (1873) published at Bombay of Hariharaṇḍaśa (according to Bhāṣa Dāya A.D. 1083–1172, see *Journ. Bombay Br. R. A. S.* ix. 223) Prāśastya Grammar which forms the eighth book of his great treatise on Sanskrit grammar, the *Siddhanta āsana* and lastly, Pischel's valuable dissertation *De Grammaticis Praeratiis* (1874), which supplements the accounts in Lassen's *Institut Linguae Praeratiis* (Bonn, 1837) with very important material.

²⁵⁰ See Schiefner's paper on the logical and grammatical writings in the Tandjur p. 25, from the *Bulletin de la Classe hist. phil. de l'Acad. Imp. des Sc. de St. Pétersbourg* iv. Nos. 18, 19 (1847), from which it appears that the *Chandra Vyākaraṇa Sūtra*, the *Kaṭhya Sūtra* and the *Sarasa Vyākaraṇa-Sūtra* in particular, are represented there.

* A Vyādi is cited in the *Rik Prātiśākhya* [and in Goldstücker's *Pāṇini* he plays a very special part. The *Samgraha* several times mentioned in the *Dhāṣya*, and there assigned to *Dakṣiṇya* is by Naṣṭa—who describes it as a work in

The question now is to determine the age of Amara-siṃha—a question which, in the first instance exactly coincides with the one already discussed as to the date of Kālidāsa, for, like the latter, Amara is specified by tradition among the ‘nine gems’ of the court of Vikrama—that Vikrama whom Indian tradition identifies with King Bhoja (A.D. 1050), but to whom European criticism has assigned the date B.C. 56, because—an era bearing this name commences with that year. The utter groundlessness of this last assumption has been already exposed in the case of Kālidāsa, though we do not here any more than there, enter the lists in defence of the Indian tradition. This tradition is distinctly contradicted, in particular, by a temple-inscription discovered at Buddhagaya, which is dated 1005 of the era of Vikramāditya (i.e., A.D. 949) and in which Amara-deva is mentioned as one of the ‘nine jewels’ of Vikrama’s court, and as builder of the temple in question. This inscription had been turned to special account by European criticism in support of its view, but Holtzmann’s researches (*op cit.*, pp. 26–32) have made it not improbable that it was put there in the same age in which Amara-siṃha’s dictionary was written, seeing that both give expression to precisely the same form of belief, a combination, namely, of Buddhism with Vishnuism—a form of faith which cannot possibly have continued very long in vogue, resting as it does on a union of directly opposite systems. At all events, inscription and dictionary cannot be so much as 1000 years apart,—that is a sheer impossibility. Unfortunately this inscription is not known to us in the original, and has only survived in the English translation made by Ch. Wilkins in 1785 (a time when he can hardly have been very proficient in Sanskrit!) the text itself is lost

100,000 *ślokas*—attributed to a Vyāḍi, meaning in all likelihood the same Vyāḍi who is elsewhere mentioned in the Bhāṣya. Now upon the strength of this, Goldstücker sets up a direct relation of kinship between Pāṇini, who is designated *Dakṣiṇapūra* in the Bhāṣya, and this (Vyāḍi) *Dakṣiṇyama*, only the former must be “at least two

generations” prior to the latter. And on this he grounds a specific ‘historical argument’ for the determination of Pāṇini’s date, for if Vyāḍi, Pāṇini’s descendant collaterally, is cited in the *Rik Pr.*, then of course this work must be later than Pāṇini, see against all this *J. S.*, v. 41, 127–133, 211, 401.

with the stone on which it was incised. That the dictionary belongs, in any case, to a period considerably later than the first century B.C.—the date commonly assigned to it—is sufficiently indicated by data furnished by the work itself. For, in the first place it enumerates the signs of the zodiac, which were unquestionably borrowed by the Hindús from the Greeks, and, according to Letronne's investigations, the completion of the zodiac did not take place among the Greeks themselves before the first century A.D., so that, of course, it cannot have become known to the Hindús till one or several centuries later. Again, in the *Amara-kosha*, the lunar mansions are enumerated in their new order, the fixing of which was due to the fresh life infused into Indian astronomy under Greek influence, the exact date being uncertain, but hardly earlier than A.D. 400. Lastly, the word *dināra* occurs here,* which, as pointed out by Prinsep, is simply the Latin *denarius* (see Lassen, *I AK*, II. 261, 348). The use of the term *tantra* in the sense of 'text-book' may perhaps also be cited in this connection, as it belongs only to a definite period, which is probably the fifth or sixth century, the Hindús who emigrated to Java having taken the word with them in this sense.²¹—All this, of course, yields us no direct date. If it be correct, as stated by Reinaud (*Mém. sur l'Inde*, p. 114), that there existed a Chinese translation of the work, "rédigée au vi^e siècle," this would give us something tolerably definite to go by. But Stan Julien does not, it would seem, in the passage cited by Reinaud as his authority, express himself in quite such definite terms, as he merely speaks of the "traduction chinoise de l'Amarakosha, qui paraît avoir été publiée"

† nor are the positive grounds he adduces in support of this view directly before us, so that we might test

* It also occurs in the *Pañcha tantra*, in a legend of Buddha's origin.—I may here also remark in passing that the word *drama*, i.e., *ἔρασμα* is employed in the twelfth century by Bhāskara as well as in inscriptions [cf. *Z D M G* vi. 420].

²¹ Of special interest also is the Arabico-Persian word *pīsh* for elephant, cf. Kumārla on Jaim., I. 3

5, cited by Colebrooke, *Asiatic Res.*, I. 314¹ (359⁷). Gildemeister in *Z D M G*, xxviii. 697.

† The meaning of *paratra*, however, is doubtful. It can signify either 'seem or be clear' (according to all evidence),—in the latter sense like the Latin *apparere*, and the English 'appear' being indeed derived from *apparere*.

them Of the Tibetan translation of the work in the Tandjur no particulars are known How great the difficulty is of arriving at any sort of decision in this matter is shown by the example of one of the most celebrated of living Indianists, H. H. Wilson For while, in the preface to the first edition of his Sanskrit Dictionary (1819), he is rather inclined to the view that Amara-siṃha flourished in the fifth century A.D., and while again, in the second edition of the work (1832) under the word 'Vararuchi,' he expressly transfers the 'nine gems' to the court of Bhoja (A.D. 1050),—in the preface (p. vi) to his translation of the *Vishnu-Purāṇa* (1840) on the contrary, he makes Amara-siṃha live "in the century prior to Christianity"—But, independently of all that has hitherto been advanced, the mere circumstance that the other dictionaries we possess, besides the Amara-kosha, all belong to the eleventh, twelfth, and following centuries, constrains us to come to a conclusion similar to that which was forced upon us in regard to the drama—namely, that as the Amara-kosha is in no way specifically distinguished in character from these other productions, so it cannot be separated from them by a very wide interval of time (Holtzmann, p. 26)*¹²

Besides the dictionaries, we have also to mention a class of lexical works quite peculiar to the Hindūs—namely, the lists of roots styled *Dhātū-pārayanas* or *Dhātū-pāṭhas* * though these belong rather to the province of grammar They are written partly in prose and partly in *ślokas* The latter is the form adopted in all the dictionaries, and it supplies, of course, a strong guarantee of the integrity of the text, the interlacing of the different verses rendering interpolation well nigh impossible †

*¹² Since the above was written, nothing new has appeared on this question To the editions of the Amara-kosha then already published, those, namely, of Colebrooke (1808) and of Lassenour Deslongchamps (Paris, 1839, 1845), various new ones have since been added in India Of other vocabularies we may mention the editions, by Bâhtsinga and Pieu (1847) of Hienia-chandra's *Abhidhāna-chintāmaṇi*,

and by Aufrecht (London 1851); † Haldarudha's *Abhidhāna-raṇa* which belongs to about the end of the eleventh century A Pāṇini-śāstra of the Amara-kosha by Yōrga and belongs to the close of the twelfth century, see *J. Str.* II. 350

* For the literature of these, see Desargues's preface to his excellent *Indices Lingue Sanscrita* (Bonn 1841)

† See Holtzmann, *op. cit.* p. 17

Lastly as a third phase of the science of language, we have to consider Metric, Poetics, and Rhetoric

With the beginnings of Prosody we have already become acquainted in connection with the Veda (see p 23) The treatise ascribed to Piṅgala even appears as an appendage to the Veda itself, however little claim it has to such a position specifying as it does the most highly elaborated metres, such as were only used in later times (see p 60) The tradition which identifies Piṅgala with Patanjali the author of the Mahabhashya and the Yoga-Sāstra must answer for itself, for us there exists no cogent reason for accepting it²⁴³ The other existing treatises on metre are likewise all modern they superseded the more ancient works, and the same is the case, in an equal degree, with the writings on poetics and rhetoric Of the *Alaṅkāra-Sāstra* of Bharata, which is often cited as the leading authority on these subjects, only the few quoted passages would seem to have survived, although, according to one commentary,* the work was itself but an extract from the *Ami-Purana* A W von Schlegel in his *Reflexions sur l'Étude des Langues Asiat.* p 111, speaks of a manuscript preserved in Paris, of the *Sāhitya-darpana*, another leading work on this subject, as dated *śaka* 949, i.e., A.D. 1027, and this, if correct, would naturally be of the highest importance for the age of the works therein quoted But *a priori* I am firmly persuaded that this statement rests on a mistake or misunderstanding,²⁴⁴ for the oldest manuscripts with which I have had any opportunity of becoming acquainted are, as already mentioned (p 182), not so much

²⁴³ Cf on this *I St.*, viii 158 ff

* See my *Catal. of the Sansk MSS in the Berl Lib* p 227 [Respecting the *Nāṭya Sāstra* of Bharata fuller information was first supplied by Hall in his edition of the *Dattarupa* (1865), at the close of which he has given the text of four chapters of the work (18-20 34), see also W Heymann's account of it in the *Göttinger Gel. Anzeigen*, 1874, p 46 ff]

²⁴⁴ The *Sāhitya darpana* was only composed towards the middle of the eighteenth century in E. Bengal, on

the banks of the Brahmaputra, see Jaganmohan-sarmān in the preface to his edition of the drama *Chandra-Kaushika* p 2 It has already been edited several times in India, amongst others by Poer in the *Bibl. Indica* (1851 vol x) Ballantyne's translation *ibid.*, is unfortunately not yet entirely printed, and reaches only to Rule 575 for the close of the work, however from Rule 631, we have a translation by Pramada Dāsa Mitra, which appeared in the *Pandit*, Nos. 4-28

as 500 years old, and it will be difficult to find any of a yet greater age—For the rest, in the field of rhetoric and poetics, the Hindú mind, so fertile in nice distinctions, has had free scope and has put forth all its power, not seldom in an extremely subtle and ingenious fashion²³

We now come to the consideration of Philosophy, as the second branch of the scientific Sanskrit literature.

I rank it here after the science of language, not because I regard it as of later origin, but because the existing text-books of the philosophical systems seem to me to be posterior to the text-book of grammar, the *Sūtra* of Pāṇini, since they appear, to some extent, to presuppose the existence of Upanishads, writings which, in their extant form, manifestly belong to a very late period, comparatively speaking

The beginnings of philosophical speculation go back, as we have already more than once seen (see especially pp 26 27), to a very remote age. Even in the *Samhita* of the Rik, although only in its later portions, we find hymns that bespeak a high degree of reflection. Here, too, as with all other peoples, it was especially the question as to the origin of the world that more imme-

²³ Dandin's *Ādhyadarsa*, of the sixth century, and Dhananjaya's *Dala-rāpo*, of the middle of the tenth century, have been published in the *Bibl. Indica*, the former edited by Premchandrar Tarkavācā (1863), the latter by Hall (1865). From these we learn, amongst other things, the very important fact that in Dandin's day two definite, provincially distinguished, varieties of style (*ritu*) were already recognised, namely, the *Gauḍa* style and the *Vaidarbha* style, to which in course of time four others the *Pāṇḍya*, *Āṇḍi*, *Arantika* and *Māgadhī* were added, cf my *Essay* on the *Pāṇḍya* style, p. 76 and I E., xiv. 63 ff. *Āṇḍi* passes for the special representative of the *Pāṇḍya* style, see Aufrecht in *Z D M G.* xviii. 93 whereas the *Kāśmīra* style, for

example, adopted the *Vaidarbha* style; see Bühler, *Vikramāśaka-char* i. 9. —Vāmana's *Ādhyadarsa* has lately been edited by Cappeller (Jena, 1875), and belongs, he thinks, to the twelfth century. Mammata's *Ādhyadarsa*, several times published in India, belongs, in Bühler's opinion, to the same date, since Mammata, according to Hall (*Introd. to Vāmana*, p. 55) was the maternal uncle of the author of the *Naishadhiya*, see Bühler in *Journ. Bomb. Br. R. A. S.* x. 37 my I E., i. 336 and my *Essay* on *Hlasa* *Sapta-śataka*, p. 11. Cf here also Aufrecht's account of the *Saravati* *kaṇṭhābhāṣya* (note 220 above). —A rich accession to the *Alampika* literature also will result from Bühler's journey to Kashmir: the works range from the sixth to the thirteenth century.

diately gave rise to philosophical contemplation. The mystery of existence of being, and of life forces itself directly upon the soul and along with this comes the question, how the riddle is to be solved and what is its cause. The idea that most readily presents itself and which is therefore, in fact, everywhere recognisable as the earliest one, is that of an eternal matter a chaotic mass, into which order and system are gradually introduced, whether—and here we have two distinct views, each of which has its intrinsic warrant and which must therefore have been early opposed to each other—by virtue of an indwelling capacity of development, or by impulse from without, whereby of course an object or Being existing outside of this chaotic mass is *ex ipso* postulated. This point reached, the idea is then a very natural one to regard this Being, whence the impulse proceeds, as higher and more exalted than the primary chaotic matter itself, and, as speculation advances, this primary matter continues to sink to a more and more subordinate position till at length its very existence appears as dependent upon the will of this Being, and so the idea of a creation arises. The steps of this gradation may actually be followed with tolerable distinctness in the Vedic texts. In the more ancient portions the notion everywhere still is that the worlds were but 'fixed,' 'arranged' (*stabhita, shabhita* *), by the aid of the *metres* (it is thus that the harmony of the universe is explained), only at a later stage is the idea developed of their *sarjara*, 'emission' or creation. As time goes on the creative Being is conceived as more and more transcendental and supernatural, so that as a means of communication between him and the real universe intermediate grades of beings, demiurges are required by classifying and systematising whom speculation strives

* It is interesting that the German word *schaffen* is derived from the root *sakh saksh*, 'establish' originally therefore it had not the sense in which it is now used. The idea of the establishment, or arrangement of the worlds may possibly therefore date from the epoch when Teutons and Indians still dwelt together or has the same use

of the word grown up independently with both peoples! Perhaps the yawning gulf of chaos, *gahvān gamahīrān girāṅga* may also be instance as a similar primitive notion! [The connection here supposed between *schaffen* and *sakh, saksh* certainly is very questionable the word seems rather to belong to *schaben* *sakshē* *sakshēu*]

to introduce order, but naturally only with the result of producing greater confusion. We have thus three distinct views as to the origin of the world—that of its 'development,' that of its 'arrangement,' and that of its 'creation.' The two former agree in so far as the theory of development requires an 'arranger' also, they are, however, sufficiently distinguished by the circumstance that in the former this Power is regarded as the first production of the capacity of development residing in primary matter, in the latter, on the contrary, as an independent Being existing outside of it. The theory of a creation starts generally with a desire on the part of the Creator to be no longer alone, the expression of which desire is immediately followed by the emanation itself. Either it is a female being that first proceeds from the Creator, in connection with whom, by a process of begetting,* he then accomplishes the further work of creation, or it is the breath of life that first of all emanates, and in its turn produces all the rest, or again, the mere expression of the desire itself involves creation, *vāc* or speech here appearing as its immediate source, or the process is conceived in a variety of other ways. The notion that the world is but Illusion only belongs to the latest phase of this emanation theory—It is impossible at present to attempt even an approximate sketch of the gradual growth of these three different theories into complete philosophical systems, the *Bṛiṣmanas* and *Upanishads* must first be thoroughly studied. Nor until this has been done will it be possible to decide the question whether for the beginnings of Greek philosophy any connection with Hindu speculation can be established—with reference to the five elements in particular,† a point which for the present is doubtful. I have already stated generally (p. 29) the reasons which lead me to assign a comparatively late date to the existing text-books (*Sūtras*) of the Hindu philosophical systems.‡

* By incest therefore the story in Megasthenes of the incest of the Ionian Herakles with his daughter refers to this.

† And the doctrine of metempsychosis.

‡ See Max Müller in *Z D M O.*

vi 15ff. [Cf. my review of Schulz's book, *Arts und Metaphysik eine Tochter der Stokholmer in Lit. Cent. II. 1874, p. 294.*]

§ Cf. Cowell on *Śaṅkara* and *Śaṅkara* in *J. J. J.* 1874. "The *Sūtras* we have them cannot be the original

Unfortunately we are not yet in possession of the treatises themselves,* and for what follows I have had to depend mainly upon Colebrooke's Essays on the subject.²⁴⁷

The most ancient philosophical system appears to be the *Sāmkhya* theory, which sets up a primordial matter as the basis of the universe, out of which the latter is by successive stages evolved. The word *Sāmkhya* itself occurs first in the later Upanishads,† while in the earlier Upanishads and Brahmanas the doctrines afterwards belonging to the *Sāmkhya* system still appear in incongruous combination with doctrines of opposite tendency, and are cited along with these under the equivalent designations of *Mīmāṃsā* (✓ *man*, speculation), *Ādeśa* (doctrine), *Upanishad* (sitting) &c. I am especially induced to regard the *Sāmkhya* as the oldest of the existing systems by the names of those who are mentioned as its leading representatives—Kapila, Pāñchāsikha, and Āsuri. The last of these names occurs very frequently in the Śatapatha-Brahmana as that of an important authority for sacrificial ritual and the like, and also in the lists of teachers contained in that work (namely

form of the doctrines of the several schools. They are rather a recapitulation of a series of preceding developments which had gone on in the works of successive teachers.'

* Only two of them have thus far appeared in India, but of the edition of the Vedānta Sūtra with Śaṅkara's commentary I have not yet been able to see a copy, only the edition of the Nyaya Sūtra is known to me. The whole of these texts are at present being edited in India by Dr. Ballantyne with English translation. [These editions entitled *Aphorisms of the Sāmkhya Vedānta, Yoga, &c.* extend to all the six systems, each sūtra being regularly followed by translation and commentary, but unfortunately only a few numbers of each have appeared.]

† In the new edition of Colebrooke's Essays (1873) these are accompanied with excellent notes by Prof. or Cowell. Since the above was written much new material has been added by the labours of Prof. Ballantyne, Hall, Cowell, Muller, Gough,

K. M. Banerjee, Barth, St. Hilaire. In the *B.M. India* and the *Berares Pandit* many highly important editions of texts have appeared, and we are now in possession of the Sūtras of all the six systems together with their leading commentaries—three of them in translation also. See also in particular the *Sāra-darśana-samgraha* of Madhava in the *B.M. Ind.* (1833-58) edited by Isvara-chandra Vidyāsāgara, and Hall's *Bibliographical Index to the Ind. Phil. Syst.* (1859).

† Of the *Tattvārtha* and *Ātharvan*, is also in the fourteenth book of the *Śukra*, and in the *Bhagavad-gītā*. As regards its sense, the term is rather obscure and not very significant, can its use have been in any way influenced and determined by its association with the doctrine of *Śākyā*? or has it reference purely and solely to the twenty-five principles? [The latter is really the case see *J. St.* 17 ff. *Kapila-tattva-samgraha*, Bhā. Par. 111, 25-1.]

as disciple of Yājñavalkya, and as only one or a few generations prior to Yaska) Kapila, again, can hardly be unconnected with the Kāpya Patañchala whom we find mentioned in the Yajñavalkya-kāṇḍa of the Vṛihad-Āraṇyaka as a zealous representative of the Brahmanical learning. Kapila, too—what is not recorded of any other of these reputed authors of Sūtras—was himself afterwards elevated to divine rank, and in this quality we meet with him, for example, in the Śvetāśvataropaniṣad.* But it is above all the close connection of his tenets with Buddhism²⁴³—the legends of which, moreover, uniformly speak both of him and of Pañchāsūkha as long anterior to Buddha—which proves conclusively that the system bearing his name is to be regarded as the oldest.²⁴⁰ The question as to the possible date of Kapila is thus closely linked with that of the origin of Buddhism generally, a point to which we shall revert in the sequel, in connection with our survey of the Buddhist literature. Two other leading doctors of the Sāṃkhya school as such appear towards the sixth century of our era, Īśvara-Kṛishna and Gaṇḍapāda the former (according to Colebrooke, l. 103) is expressly stated

* In the invocations of the Pāṭis which (see above, pp. 55-56) form part of the ordinary ceremonial Kapila, Asuri Pañchāsūkha (and with them a Vojha or Bodha) uniformly occupy a very honourable place in later times, whereas notice is more rarely taken of the remaining authors of philosophical Sūtras, &c. This too proves that the former are more ancient than the latter.

²⁴³ This relates, according to Wilson, to the community of the fundamental propositions of both in regard to the eternity of matter, the principles of things and the final extinction (Wilson, *Works*, II. 346, ed. Post.) In opposition to this it is true, Max Müller expressly denies any special connection whatever between Kapila's system as embodied in the Sūtras, and Buddhist metaphysics (*Chips from a German Workshop* 1. 226-1870), yet he himself immediately afterwards gives the correct

explanation of this, when he says that the existing sūtras of Kapila are "of later date, posterior, not anterior, to Buddha." On the subject itself, see especially *I. S.*, III. 132-133.

²⁴⁰ In the sacred texts of the Jains also not only is the *Saṅgha-lanta* (*Śaṅkha-lanta*, explained by the comm. as *Kapila-Sāstra*) specified along with the four Vedas and their Aṅgas, but in another passage the name Kāvila appears along with it, the only other Brahmanical system here mentioned being the Balaesiya (Vaiśeṣika). (The order in which they are given is Balaesiya, Buddha-sāṃkhya Kāvila, Logdyāṭa, Saṅgha-lanta.) So also in a similar enumeration in the *Śaṅkha-lanta*, after Sāṃkhya Yoga only Vaiśeṣika is further specified. See my paper on the Bhagvatī of the Jains, II. 246-248.

to be the author of the existing Samkhya-Sūtra, while the latter embodied its doctrine in several Upanishads²⁰

Connected with the Samkhya school, as a further development of it, is the Yoga system of Patanjali²¹ whose name describes him as in all probability a descendant of the Kapya Patanjala of the Vrihad-Aranyaka. Along with him (or prior to him) Yajnavalkya, the leading authority of the Śatapatha-Brahmana, is also regarded as a main originator of the Yoga doctrine, but this only in later writings.* Whether Patanjali is to be identified with the

²⁰ The Sūtras of Kapila, the so called *Sāmkhya-pravachana*, are now published, with the commentary of Vyāsa-bhikṣu in the *Bibl. Ind.*, edited by Hall (1834-36), a translation by Ballantyne also appeared in the same series, 1862-65. In his preface to the *S. Prav.* as well as in the preface some years later to his edition of *Vyāsa-bhikṣu's Samkhya Sāra*, Hall gives a special account, with which, however, he is himself by no means satisfied (see his note to Wilson's *Vishnu Pur.* iii 301) of Kapila and the leading works extant of the Sāmkhya system. He regards the *Sāmkhya-pravachana* as a very late production which may here and there even be suspected of occasional obligation to the *Kārikās* of Īśvarakṛishna (*Sāmkhya sūtra* Preface p. 12). Of course this does not affect either the antiquity of Kapila himself or his 'alleged connection with the Sāmkhya' (p. 20). Cowell, too (Colebrooke's *Vedic L.* i 354, note) regards the Sāmkhya school as if "as one of the earliest" while the Sūtras on the contrary, are of late origin, inasmuch as they not only refer distinctly to Vedānta texts but also expressly mention the *Vaisheshika* in i 25 v 85 for the *Nyāya* cf. v 27, 86 and for the *Yoga* i 90. Besides the *Vaiśeṣika* (i 23), only *Pañchashikha* (v 32, v 68) and *Sanandanāchārya* (vi 69) are actually mentioned by name. An interesting detail is the opposing of the names *Sṛagha* and

Pātāliputra (i 28) as an illustration of separate locality (similarly in the *Mahābhāṣya*, see *I St.* xiii 378).

²¹ The Yoga Sūtra ascribed to Patanjali (likewise called *Sāmkhya-pravachana Sūtra*), with extracts from Bhoja's commentary upon it, was edited, text with translation, to the extent of one half, by Ballantyne in his *Aphorisms*, the second half appeared in the *Pandit* Nos. 28-68, edited by Govinda deva āśtrīn — An *Ārya-pāñchāśikā* by Śeṣha (whom the editor identifies with Patanjali) in which the relation of *prakṛti* and *puruṣa* is elucidated in a *Vaiśeṣika* sense was edited by Bālāśtrīn in No. 56 of the *Pandit*, there exists also a *Saiva* adaptation of it by Abhinavagupta see *Z D H G* xvii 167. According to Buhler's letter (*I St.* xiv 402 ff.), Abhinavagupta is supposed to have died in A.D. 930, but Buhler has not himself verified the date, which is stated to occur in the hymn written by Abhinava on his deathbed.

* Particularly in the twelfth book of the *Mahā-Bhārata*, where with Janaka, he is virtually described as a Buddhist teacher, the chief outward badge of these teachers being precisely the *śākyā dharmarāmaṇḍyam* (*M. Bh.* xii 1189S 566). It appears, at all events, from the *Yajnavalkya-kāṇḍa* that both gave a powerful impetus to the practice of religious mendicancy in the *Aśramashāstra* (see *Śa. Sm.* i 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100).

author of the Mahabhashya remains for the present a question. The word *yoga* in the sense of 'union with the Supreme Being,' 'absorption therein by virtue of meditation,' first occurs in the later Upanishads, especially in the tenth book of the Taittiriya-Aranyaka and in the Kathakopaniṣad, where this very doctrine is itself enunciated²¹. As there presented, it seems to rest substantially upon a dualism, that is, upon the 'arrangement' theory of the universe, in this sense, however, that in the Kathakopaniṣad at least, *puruṣa*, primeval soul, is conceived as existing prior to *avyakta*, primordial matter, from the union of which two principles the *raśātā d'mā*, or spirit of life, is evolved. For the rest, its special connection with the Sāṃkhya system is still, in its details, somewhat obscure, however well attested it is externally by the constant juxtaposition of 'Sāṃkhya-Yoga,' generally as a compound. Both systems appear, in particular, to have countenanced a confounding of their *puruṣa*, *īśvara* with the chief divinities of the popular religion, Rudra and Kṛṣṇa, as may be gathered from the Śvetāśvataraopaniṣad,²² the Bhagavad-gītā, and many passages in the twelfth book of 'the Māhā-Bhārata.* One very peculiar side of the Yoga

v. Śiva-Sūtr 11, in. 110, Y. describes himself expressly as the author of the Aranyaka as well as of the Yoga-Sūtra.]

²¹ It is in these and smaller Upanishads, as a so in Manu's Dharmasūtra (cf. Johnsen's Essay on the Law Book of Manu, 1863), that we have to look for the earliest germs and records of the atheistic Sāṃkhya and the devine Yoga systems.

²² In my paper on the Svetāśvataraopaniṣad I had to leave the point undetermined whether, for the period to which this work belongs, and especially as regards the notion of a Yoga system it embodies an acquaintance with the corresponding doctrines of Christianity is to be assumed or not; see *J. E.*, 1. 423. However, on the other hand, in his translation of the Bhagavad-gītā (Berlin, 1860) unexpressedly assumes such an acquaintance in the case of this poem. From the point

of view of literary chronology no forcible objection can be brought against this; some of the points too, which he urges are not without importance but on the whole he has greatly over-estimated the scope of his argument the question is still undecided.

* More particularly with regard to the Bhāgavata, Pāṇcharitra, and Pūṇyāra doctrines. [A Sūtra of the Pāṇcharitra school, that, name Y, of Śāṅkara (ed. by Balakrishna in the *Ed. Indica*, 1861), is apparently mentioned by Śaṅkara, Vedānt. S. Dh. II. 2. 45. It runs, *śeṣaṁ v*, upon the Bhāgavad-gītā, and lays special stress upon faith in the Supreme Being (*brahmet*), see on it Cowell's note in Colbrooke's *Mon. Ind.* 1. 433. On the development of the doctrine of Māhā, Wilson surmises Christian conceptions to have had some influence, see my paper on the Rām. Tāp. Up., pp. 277, 360. The

doctrine—and one which was more and more exclusively developed as time went on—is the Yoga practice, that is the outward means, such as penances, mortifications and the like, whereby this absorption into the supreme God head is sought to be attained. In the epic poems, but especially in the Atharvopaniṣads, we encounter it in full force. Pāṇini, too, teaches the formation of the term *yogin*.

The most flourishing epoch of the Sāṃkhya-Yoga belongs most probably to the first centuries of our era, the influence it exercised upon the development of Gnosticism in Asia Minor being unmistakable, while further, both through this channel and afterwards directly also, it had an important influence upon the growth of the Sūfī philosophy*. Albīrūnī translated Patanjali's work into Arabic at the beginning of the eleventh century, and also, it would appear, the Sāṃkhya-Sūtra† though the information we have as to the contents of these works does not harmonise with the Sanskrit originals.

The doctrines of the two *Mīmāṃsās* appear to have been reduced to their present systematic shape at a later period than those of the Sāṃkhya,²⁵³ and, as indicated by their respective names, in the case of the *Pūrva-Mīmāṃsā* earlier than in the case of the *Uttara-Mīmāṃsā*. The essential purpose of both *Mīmāṃsas* is to bring the doctrines enunciated in the Brahmanas or sacred revelation into harmony and accord with each other. Precepts relating to practice form the subject of the *Pūrva Mīmāṃsa*, which is hence also styled *Karika-Mīmāṃsā*, while doctrines regarding the essence of the creative principle and its relation to the

Nārāyaṇa-Pañcharātra (ed. ted in *Bibl Ind* by K. M. Banerjya, 1851-65) is a ritual notaphilosophical Vaiṣṇava text-book.]

* See [Las en, I 4K, in 379 ff] Goldmeister *Script Arab de reb Ind.*, p. 112 ff

† Peisaud in the *Journ. Anat.*, 1844, pp. 121-124. H. M. Filot, *Bibl Index to the Hist of Muhammedan India*, i. 100

²⁵³ Now that the antiquity of the extant form of the Sāṃkhya Sūtras according to Hall, has become so exceedingly doubtful, the view above expressed also becomes in its turn

very questionable. Besides, as we shall presently see, in both the *Mīmāṃsā-Sūtras* teachers are repeatedly cited who are known to us from the Vedic Sūtra literature while nothing of the kind occurs in either of the Sāṃkhya pravachana Sūtras. This does not of course touch the point of the higher antiquity of the doctrines in question, for the names Kapila, Patanjali, and Yāgyavalkya distinctly carry us back to a far earlier time than do the names Jaimini and Bīdarāja—namely, into the closing phases of the Brāhmaṇa literature itself.

universe form the subject of the Uttara-Mīmāṃsā, which is hence also designated *Brahma-Mīmāṃsā Śāstraka-Mīmāṃsā* ('doctrine of embodied spirit'), or also *Vēdānta* ('end of the Veda'). The term 'Mīmāṃsā' originally denotes merely speculation in general, it occurs frequently in this sense in the Brāhmanas, and only became a technical expression later,²⁵⁴ as is probably the case also with 'Vēdānta,' a word first occurring in the later Upanishads, in the tenth book of the Taittiriya-Āraṇyaka, the Kathakopanishad, Mundakopanishad, &c.

The *Karma-Mīmāṃsā-Sūtra* is ascribed to Jaimini, who is mentioned in the Puranas as the revealer of the Samaveda, though we search in vain in Vedic literature for any hint of his name* Still, of the teachers who

²⁵⁴ In the Mahābhāṣya, *mīmāṃsā*, according to Kaiyaṣa, is to be taken in the sense of *mīmāṃsāda* *adhiṣṭe*; and as the term also occurs therein contradistinctive to *aukṣiṭe* it might in point of fact, refer to the subject of the Purva Mīmāṃsā. Still the proper word here for one specially devoted to such studies would rather seem to be *yajurika*, see *I St*, xii, 455-456.

* With the exception of two probably interpolated passages in the Gṛhyasūtras of the Rik (see pp 56-58) — Nor is there anything bearing on it in the Gaṇapāṭha of Pāṇini — of which indeed, for the present, only a negative use can be made, and even this only with proper caution. But as the word is irregularly formed (from *Jaman* we should expect *Jaimini*) this circumstance may here, perhaps carry some weight. (Apparently it is not found in the Mahābhāṣya either, see *I St* xii, 455. On the other hand the name *Jaimini* occurs in the concluding *śāṇḍa* of the Sāma vidhāna-Brāhm (v *I St* iv 377) and here the bearer of it is described as the disciple of Vyāsa Parāśarya and preceptor of a Paṇḍya vidya which answers exactly to the statement in the Vishnu Pur *iii*, 6, 1, 4, where he appears as the teacher of Paṇḍipuru (cf also Ra

ghuv, 18, 32, 33). The special relation of Jaimini to the Sāma-Veda appears also from the statements in the Rig Gṛhyas (see note 49 above) which agree with Vishnu Pur, iii, 4, 8, 9. Indeed, the Charapa vidhāna specifies a Jaiminiya recension of the Sāman, and this recension appears to be still in existence (see note 60 above). In the Pravara section of the Aśval Śrauta-S, xii, 10, the Jaiminis are classed as belonging to the Bhṛguas — All this, however, does not afford us any direct clue to the date of our Jaimini above, whose work, besides, is properly more related to the Yajur- than to the Sāma-Veda. According to the Pañchatantra, the 'Mīmāṃsāky' Jaimini was killed by an elephant — a statement which, considering the antiquity of this work, is always of some value, although, on the other hand, unfortunately in consequence of the many changes its text has undergone we have no guarantee that this particular notice formed part of the original text which found its way to Persia in the sixth century (cf *I St*, viii, 159). — There is also an astrological (Jātaka) treatise which goes by the name of Jaimini Sūtra, see *Catal of Str MS² N W Pr* (1874) pp 508, 510, 514-52.)

are cited in this Sūtra—Ātreya, Badari, Badarāyana, Labukāyana (?),²⁵⁵ Aitśāyana—the names of the first and second, at all events, may be pointed out in the Taittiriya-Pratishakhyā and the Śrauta-Sūtra of Katyāyana respectively, while we meet with the family of the Aitśāyanas in the Kaushītaki-Brāhmana.* Badarayana is the name of the author of the *Brahma-Mīmāṃsā Sūtra*, but it by no means follows from the mention of him here that his Sūtra is older than the Sūtra of Jaimini, for not only may the name, as a patronymic, have designated other persons besides, but in the Sūtra of the *Brahma-Mīmāṃsā* the case is exactly reversed, and Jaimini in his turn is mentioned there. All that results from this, as well as from the fact of each Sūtra frequently citing its own reputed author, is rather that these Sūtras were not really composed by these teachers themselves, but only by their respective schools† The name Badarayana is *not* to be found “in Panini,” as has recently been erroneously asserted,‡ but only in the *gana-pāṭha* to Panini, not a very rare authority for the present—As leading expounders of the Jaimini-Sūtra we have mention of Śabara-svāmin,²⁵⁶ and, after him, of Kumārila-bhaṭṭa,²⁵⁷ the latter is said to have flourished prior to Śaṅkara.§

²⁵⁵ In the passage in question (vi. 7. 37) ought we not to read *Lāma kāyana*? This is the name of a teacher who is several times mentioned in the *Sāma-Sūtras* see *I Str.* iv. 384, 373.—The apparent mention of Buddha in i. 2. 33 (*buddha-kāśīrāṣi*) is only apparent here the word ‘buddha’ has nothing whatever to do with the name ‘Buddha.’—To the above names must, however, be added *Kārahna* jini (iv. 3. 17, vi. 7. 35) and *Kāmu kāyana* (xi. 1. 51), the former of these is found also in *Kātyāyana* and in the *Vedānta Sūtra*, the latter only in the *gana* *Naṣa*.

* *xxx. 5* where they are characterised as the scum of the *Bhṛigu* line “*pāpabāhā Bhṛigūndam*.”

† See Colebrooke i. 102, 103, 328 and above p. 49.

‡ By Max Müller in his otherwise most valuable contributions to our knowledge of Indian philosophy in the *Z D M G* vi. 9.

²⁵⁶ This commentary of Śabara-svāmin, which is even cited by Śaṅkara (*Vedānta-Sūtra-bh.*, iii. 3. 53), with the text of Jaimini itself, is at present still in course of publication in the *Bibl Ind.*, ed. by Mahāschandra Nyāyaratna (begun in 1863, the last part, 1871, brings it down to ix. 1. 5).—Mādhava’s *Jaiminiya nyāya māhā-viṣaya* edited by Goldastücker (1865 ff.), is also still unfinished, see my *I Str.*, ii. 376 ff.

²⁵⁷ Who appears also to have borne the odd name of *Tutāta* or even *Tutātita*. At all events, *Tatātika* or *Tutātita*, is interpreted by the scholiast of the *Prabodha-chandrodaya*, 20 q, ed. Brockhaus, to mean Kumārila and the same explanation is given by Aufrecht in his *Catalogue*, p. 247, in the case of the *Tatātita* mentioned in *Mādhava’s Sāva-dāśana samgraha*.

§ See Colebrooke, i. 298 yet the tolerably modern title *bhaṭṭa* awakens some doubt as to this it may

The *Brahma-Sūtra** belongs, as we have just seen, to Bādarayana. The notion that creation is but illusion, and that the transcendental Brahman is alone the Real, but throning in absolute infinitude without any personal existence, is the fundamental doctrine of this system. The attempt is here made to demonstrate that this doctrine is the end and aim of the Veda itself, by bringing all Vedic passages into harmony with this monotheistic pantheism, and by refuting the various views of the Samkhya, or atheistic, the Yoga, or theistic, and the Nyaya, or deistic schools, &c. The notice thus taken of the other systems would of itself seem to prove the posteriority of the *Brahma-Sūtra*, still, it is for the present uncertain whether its polemic is in fact directed against these systems in the form in which we now have them, or merely perhaps against the original tenets out of which these systems have sprung. The teachers' names, at least, which are mentioned in the *Brahma-Sūtra* recur to a large extent in the *Srauta-Sūtras*, for example, Āśmarathya in Āśvalāyana, † Badari, Karṣṇājini and Kāśakṛtsna in Kātyāyana [see above, p. 139], and, lastly, Ātreya in the Taittirīya-Pratishākhya. The name Audulomi belongs exclusively to the *Brahma-Sūtra*.²³⁷ The mention of Jaimini and of Bādarayana himself has been already touched upon — Windischmann in his excellent "*Śamkara*" (Bonn, 1832)

not have belonged to him originally perhaps. (According to Cowell, note to Colebrooke's *Misc. Ess.*, i. 323, there actually occur in *Samkara* 'allusions to Kumārila bhaṭṭa, if no direct mention of him,' the title *Bhaṭṭa* belongs quite specially to him "he is emphatically designated by his title *Bhaṭṭa*." For the rest, this title belongs likewise to *Bhaṭṭa Bhāskara Miśra* and *Bhaṭṭotpala*, and therefore is not by any means 'tolerably modern'.)

* This name itself occurs in the *Bhagavad-gītā*, xii. 4 but here it may be taken as an appellative rather than as a proper name.

† We have already seen (p. 53) that the *Āśmarathah* Kalpa is so stanced by Pāṇini's scholiast as an

example of the new Kalpa, in contradistinction to the earlier ones and so is regarded as of the same age with Pāṇini. If, as is likely the scholiast took this illustration from the *Mahābhāṣya* [but this is not the case, v. 1. 81, xiii. 455] then this statement is important. I may mention in passing that *Āśmarathya* occurs in the *gāṇa* 'Garga Audulomi in the *gāṇa* Bāhu, Karṣṇājina in the *gāṇa* 'Tika and 'Upaka' in the latter also *Kāśakṛtsna*. The *Gāṇa pāṭha*, however is a most uncertain authority, and for Pāṇini's time without weight.

²³⁷ It is found in the *Mahābhāṣya* also, on Pāṇini iv. 1. 85. 78, see *I. St.*, xiii. 415.

has attempted directly to fix the age of the Brahma-Sūtra. For Badarayana bears also the additional title of Vyasa whence, too, the Brahma-Sūtra is expressly styled Vyasa Sūtra. Now, in the Samkara-vijaya—a biography of the celebrated Vedānta commentator Śamkara, reputed to be by one of his disciples—we find it stated (see Windischmann p 85, Colebrooke, 1 104) that Vyasa was the name of the father of Śuka, one of whose disciples was Gaudapada, the teacher of Govindanatha, who again was the preceptor of Śamkara,²⁵⁸ so that the date of this Vyasa might be conjecturally set down as from two to three centuries prior to Śamkara, that is, between 400 and 500 A D. But the point must remain for the present undetermined,* since it is open to question whether this Vyasa ought really to be identified with Vyasa Badarayana, though this appears to me at least very probable.²⁵⁹

²⁵⁸ See now in Aufrecht's *Catalogus*, p 255^b, the passage in question from Mādhava's (?) Śamkara-vijaya, v 5 (rather v 105 according to the ed of the work published at Bombay in 1864 with Dhanapati Śārī's commentary), and *ibid.*, p 227^b, the same statements from another work. The Śamkara-vijaya of Anandagiri, on the contrary Aufrecht, p 247 ff (now also in the *Bibl. Ind.*, edited by Jayanārāyaṇa, 1864-1878) contains nothing of this.

* Śamkara, on Brahma Sūtra, in 3 32 mentions that Apāntaratamas lived as Kṛishna-Dvaipāyana at the time of the transition from the Kali to the Dvāpara yuga and from the fact of his not at the same time expressly stating that this was Vyāsa Bṛhādyāna, author of the Brahma Sūtra, Windischmann concludes, and justly that in Śamkara's eyes the two personages were distinct. In the *Maha Bhārata* on the contrary in 12158 ff Śuka is expressly given as the son of Kṛishna Dvaipāyana (Vyāsa Bṛhādyāna). But the episode in question is certainly one of the very latest insertions as is clear from the allusion to the Chi-

nas and Hūnas, the Chinese and Huns.

²⁵⁹ In the meantime, the name Bādarāyana is only known to occur, besides in the closing verse of the *Sāma Vaidhā* Br see *I St.*, iv 377, and here the bearer of it appears as the disciple of Pārāśaryāna, four steps later than Vyāsa Bṛhādyāna, and three later than Jaimini, but, on the other hand, as the teacher (?) of Tāndin and Śātyāyana. Besides being mentioned in Jaimini, he is also cited in the *Sāndilya Sūtra*. In Varāha Mihira and Bhaṭṭotpala an astronomer of this name is referred to, and he, in his turn, according to Aufrecht (*Catalogus* p 329^a), alludes in a passage quoted from him by Utpala, to the *Yavana-vriddhā* and, according to Kern *Préf. to Brh. Samh.*, p 51 "exhibits many Greek words."—The text of the Brahma Sūtra, with Śamkara's commentary, has now been published in the *Bibl. Ind.* edited by Roer and (from part 3) Rāma Nārāyaṇa Vidyaratna (1854-1863) of the translation of both by K M Banerjya, as of that in Ballantyne's *aphorisms* only one part has appeared (1870).

In respect of their reduction to systematic shape, the logical Sūtras of Kanada and Gotama appear to rank last. But this by no means indicates that these logical inquiries are themselves of later origin—on the contrary, the other Sūtras almost uniformly begin with such—but merely that the formal development of logic into two philosophical schools took place comparatively late. Neither of the schools restricts itself to logic alone, each embraces, rather, a complete philosophical system, built up however, upon a purely dialectical method. But as yet little has been done to elucidate the points of difference between the two in this regard²⁰⁰. The origin of the world is in both derived from atoms, which combine by the will of an arranging Power²⁰¹. Whether the name of the *Πράμναι*, who are described by Strabo as contentious dialecticians, is to be traced to the word *pramāṇa*, 'proof,' as Lassen supposes is doubtful. The word *tarka*, 'doubt,' again, in the Kāthakopaniṣad, ought rather, from the context, to be referred to the Sāṃkhya doctrines, and should not be taken in the sense, which at a later period is its usual one, of 'logic.' In Manu too (see Lassen, *J. A. K.*, i. 835), according to the traditional interpretation *tarkin* still denotes 'one versed in the Mīmāṃsā logic'²⁰². Yet Manu is also acquainted with logic as a distinct

²⁰⁰ In this respect, Roer in particular has done excellent service in the copious notes to his translation of the *Vaiśeṣika-Sūtra* he has throughout special regard to this very point (in *Z. D. M. G.*, vols. xx, xxiii 1867, 1868). Before him, Müller with some of Ballantyne's writings as a basis, had already taken the same line (in vols. vi and vii of the same *Journal* 1852-1853). The text of the *Vaiśeṣika-Sūtras* with the commentary called *Upaniṣad*, of Śaṅkara-miśra, appeared in *Bibl. Ind.* in 1860-1861, edited, with a gloss of his own, by Jaya Nārāyaṇa Tarkapañcānana. In the *Pandit* (Nov. 32-69) there is a complete translation of both text and commentary by A. P. Gough. *Jaya Nārāyaṇa* has also since then (1864-65)

edited, in the *Bibl. Ind.*, the *Nyāya-darśana* of Gotama with the commentary of Vātsyāyana (Pakṣhīla svāmīn). The earlier edition (1828) was accompanied with the commentary of Viśvanātha. The first four books have been translated by Ballantyne in his *Aphorisms*.

²⁰¹ We find the atomic theory especially developed among the Jains, and that in a materialistic form yet so that the atomic matter and the vital principle are conceived to be in eternal intimate connection, see my *Essay on the Bhagavati of the Jains*, ii. 168-176-190-236. We have a mythological application of it in the assumption of a *prajāpati* Marichi: see *J. St.*, ix. 9.

²⁰² In *Pārask.* ii. 6 ('*vidur vilāpasya caśale bra-velah*'), 'ar'ka is equivalent to *arthavadda* *śūmanśa*.

science, as well as with the three leading methods of proof which it teaches, though not under the names that were afterwards usual. According to the most recent investigations on the subject * "the terms *naiyāyika* and *kevala-naiyāyika* (Pan, II. 1. 49) would point to the Nyaya system as antecedent to Pāṇini ' these words, however, do not occur in the text of Pāṇini at all (which has merely the word *kevala* †), but only in his scholiast ‡—Kanada's system bears the name *Vaiśeṣika Sūtra*, because its adherents assert that *viśeṣa*, 'particularity,' is predicable of atoms, the system of Gotama, on the other hand, is styled *Nyāya-Sūtra*, kar' εἰσρηγ. Which of the two is the older is still uncertain. The circumstance that the doctrines of the Vaiśeṣikas are frequently the subject of refutation in the Vedānta-Sūtra,—whereas Gotama's teaching is nowhere noticed, either in the text or in the commentaries upon it, as stated by Colebrooke (I. 352).—tells *a priori* in favour of the higher antiquity of the former,²⁵² but whether the author of the Vedānta had these 'doctrines of Kanāda' before him in their systematised form, as has recently been assumed, ‡ is a point still requiring investigation.²⁵⁴—For the rest, these two systems are at

* By Max Müller I. c., p. 9.

† This is one of the cases of which I have already spoken (p. 225).

‡ In the Sāṃkhya Sūtra they are even expressly mentioned by name (see p. 237), also in the sacred text of the Jains (v. note 249).—The circumstance that the Gotama Sūtra does not, like the other five philosophical text-books, begin with the customary Sūtra formula, 'atthā tathā, may perhaps also be regarded as a sign of later composition.

§ M. Müller, I. c., p. 9. "Whereas Kanāda's doctrines are there frequently discussed."

²⁵² In neither of the Sūtras are there references to older teachers whose names might supply some chronological guidance. As regards the names of their authors themselves, Kanāda or Kanabhin (Kanabhinakha) is mentioned by Varha Mihira and Sūnaka, while Akṣapāda, so far

as we know at present, is first mentioned by Mādhyama. Their patronymics, Kāśyapa and Gautama (this form is preferable to Gotama) date, it is true, from a very early time, but beyond this, they tell us nothing. Of interest, certainly, although without decisive weight, is the identification—occurring in a late commentator (Anantayaśvan) on the Piṭamedha-Sūtra of Gautama belonging to the Sāma Veda—of this latter Gautama with Akṣapāda, see Burnell's Catalogue, p. 57.—From Cowell's preface to his edition of the Kuṣumāñjali (1864) it appears that the commentary of Paṇḍita-śrīdhara, whom he directly identifies with Vātsyāyana, was composed prior to Diṇāga, that is to say (see note 219 above) somewhere about the beginning of the sixth century. Uddyotakara, who is mentioned by Subandha in the seventh century, wrote against Diṇāga, and

present and have been for a long time past, those most in favour in India, and it would also appear that among the philosophical writings contained in the Tibetan Tandjur, logical works are the most numerous represented.

Besides these six systems, all of which won for themselves a general currency, and which on the whole are regarded as orthodox—however slight is the title of the Sāṃkhya theory, for instance, to be so esteemed—we have frequent mention of certain heterodox views, as those of the Charvakas, Laukayatikas,²⁶⁵ Bārhaspatyas. Of this last-mentioned school there must also have existed a complete system, the Bārhaspatya Sūtra, but of all this nothing has survived save occasional quotations, introduced with a view to their refutation, in the commentaries of the orthodox systems.

We now come to the third branch of the scientific literature, Astronomy, with its auxiliary sciences.* We have already seen (pp. 112, 113) that astronomy was cultivated to a considerable extent even in Vedic times, and we found it expressly specified by Strabo (see pp. 29, 30) as a favourite pursuit of the Brahmans. It was at the same time remarked, however, that this astronomy was still in a very elementary stage, the observations of the heavens being still wholly confined to a few fixed stars, more especially to the twenty-seven or twenty-eight lunar asterisms, and to the various phases of the moon itself.²⁶⁶ The circumstance that the Vedic year is a solar year of 360 days,

so did Vācaspati miśra in the tenth and Udayana, the author of the *Kusumājñāli*, in the twelfth century: see also Cowell's note to Colebrooke's *Misc. Ess.*, i. 282. Gaṅgeśa's Nyāya-chintāmaṇi, the most important work of the later Nyāya literature is also placed in the twelfth century: see *Z. D. M. O.* xiii. 163. Aulūkyā given by Mādhyama as a name for the tenets of Kaṇva rests on a play upon the word *kaṇva* 'crow-eater' = *ulūka*.

²⁶⁵ In the *Mahābhāṣya* there is mention of a 'ramikā Bhāguri loka-jātara', see *I. St.*, xii. 343.

A Bhāguri appears among the teachers cited in the *Bṛhad-āraṇyaka*. The Lokāyatās are also repudiated by the Buddhists, Northern as well as Southern, v. Burnouf, *Lotus de la doctrine* Let. pp. 409, 470. The Jains too, rank their system only with *loiya- (lākṣa)* knowledge: see above, note 249.—On the Charvakas see the introduction of the *Sarva-darśana-samgraha*.

* See *I. St.*, ii. 235-237.

²⁶⁶ The cosmical or astronomical data met with in the *Bṛhadmanas* are all of an extremely childish and naive description, see *I. St.*, ii. 238 ff.

and not a lunar year, does indeed presuppose a tolerably accurate observation and computation of the sun's course, but, agreeably to what has just been stated, we can hardly imagine that this computation proceeded upon the phenomena of the nocturnal heavens, and we must rather assume it to have been based upon the phenomena of the length or shortness of the day, &c. To the elaboration of a quinquennial cycle with an intercalary month a pretty early date must be assigned, since the latter is mentioned in the *Rik-Samhita*. The idea of the four mundane ages, on the contrary—although its origin, from observation of the moon's phases, may possibly be of extreme antiquity²⁶⁷—can only have attained to its complete development towards the close of the Vedic period. Megasthenes, as we know, found the Yuga system flourishing in full perfection. That the Hindú division of the moon's path into twenty-seven (or twenty eight) lunar mansions is of Chinese origin as asserted by Biot (*Journal des Savants*, 1840, 1845, see Lassen, *I AK*, i. 742 ff) can hardly be admitted²⁶⁸. Notwithstanding the accounts of Chinese writers, the contrary might equally well be the case, and the system might possibly have been introduced into China through the medium of Buddhism, especially as Buddhist writings adhere to the ancient order of the asterisms—commencing with *Krittiká*—precisely as we find it among the Chinese²⁶⁹.

²⁶⁷ Roth disputes this origin in his Essay, *Die Lehre von den vier Weltalter* (1860, Lubingen).

²⁶⁸ On the questions dealt with in what follows, a special discussion was ruled between J. B. Biot myself, and Whitney, in which A. Sédiot, Steinschneider, E. Burgess, and Max Müller also took part. Cf. the *Journal des Savants* for 1859, and Biot's posthumous *Études sur l'Astronomie Indienne et Chinoise* (1862) my two papers, *Die Vedischen Nachrichten von den Nakshatra* (1860-1862), as also *I Str.* ii. 172, 173, *I St.*, ix. 424 ff (1865), i. 213 ff (1866), Whitney in *Journ. Asi. Soc.*, vols. vi. and viii (1860-1861-1865) Burgess *ibid.*, Steinschneider in *Z. D. M. G.*, xviii (1863) Müller in Pref. to vol. iv of his edition of the *Rik* (1862) Sédiot's

Courtes Observations sur quelques Points de l'Histoire de l'Astronomie (1863) and, lastly Whitney in the second vol. of his *Oriental and Linguistic Studies* (1874). To the views expressed above I still essentially adhere. Whitney, too, inclines towards them. In favour of Chaldean having been the mother country of the system, one circumstance, amongst others, tells with especial force viz. that from China, India, and Babel we have precisely the same accounts of the length of the longest day, whilst the statements, e.g., in the *Bundehesch* on this head, exhibit a total divergence see Windischmann (*Zoroastrische Studien*, p. 105).

²⁶⁹ This assertion of Biot's has not been confirmed. The Chinese list commences with *Chitrá* (i.e. the autumnal equinox), or *Uttaráshāḍhā*.

To me, however, the most probable view is that these lunar mansions are of Chaldaean origin, and that from the Chaldaeans they passed to the Hindus as well as to the Chinese. For the *מנולות* of the Book of Kings, and the *מנולות* of the Book of Job,²⁷⁰ which the Biblical commentators erroneously refer to the zodiac, are just the Arabic *منال*, 'mansions,' and here even Biot will hardly suppose a Chinese origin. The Indians may either have brought the knowledge of these lunar mansions with them into India, or else have obtained it at a later time through the commercial relations of the Phoenicians with the Panjáb. At all events they were known to the Indians from a very early period and as communication with China is altogether inconceivable at a time when the Hindus were perhaps not even acquainted with the mouths of the Ganges, Chinese influence is here quite out of the question. The names of some of these asterisms occur even in the *Rik Samhitá* (and that under peculiar forms), for example, the *Aghás*, i.e., *Maghás*, and the *Aryunyau*, i.e., *Phalgunyau*—a name also applied to them in the *Satapatha Brahmana*—in the nuptial hymn, *mandala* x 85 13, further, *Tishya* in *mandala* v 54 13, which, however, is referred by Sáyana to the sun (see also x 64 8). The earliest complete enumeration of them, with their respective regents, is found in the *Taittiríya-Sam-*

(the winter solstice), both of which rather correspond to an arrangement in which Revatí passes as the sign of the vernal equinox, see my first essay on the *Nakshatras* p. 300.—Cf. here also the account of the twenty-eight lunar asterisms, contained in a letter from Wassiljew to Schiefner (see the latter's German translation of the Preface to Wassiljew's Russian rendering of Tárantsha's history of Buddhism, pp. 30-32, 1869), and commonly cited, according to the commentary in the Buddhist Lexicon *Mahávyutpatti* from the book *Sannipáta* (Chinese *Ta-tsing*). According to this account, it was the astronomer Kharoshthá (an *a-lip*)—a name which, as well as that of Zarosir, who as Armenian authorities state, originated the science of astro-

nomy in Chaldaea. Wassiljew compares with Zoroaster but in which I am inclined rather to look for the Kharoshthá whose acquaintance we make in the *Atharva Paríś* (see *Ju. U. Bl.*, 1869 p. 2497)—who arranged the constellations in the order quoted in the Dictionary in question, that is, beginning with *Āśvīnā*. Afterwards there came another Rishi, Kśīra (Time 1), who set up a new theory in regard to the motion of the constellations, and so in course of time Chitrā came to be named as the first asterism. To all appearance, this actually proves the late and Buddhistic origin of the Chinese Kio list, see *Nakshatras*, i 306.

²⁷⁰ On this point see specially *J. St.*, x. 217.

hitá, a second, which exhibits considerable variation in the names, betokening a later date, occurs in the Atharva-Samhitá and the Taittiriya-Bráhmāna, the majority of the names are also given in Panini. This latter list contains for the most part the names employed by the later astronomers, and it is precisely these later ones that are enumerated in the so-called Jyotisha or Vedic Calendar (along with the zodiacal signs too!) To this latter treatise an importance has hitherto been attributed to which its contents do not entitle it. Should my conjecture be confirmed that the Lagadha, Lagata, whose system it embodies, is identical with the Lat who is mentioned by Al-Birūnī as the author of the ancient Sūrya-Siddhānta [see, however, p. 258 n], then it would fall in the fourth or fifth century of our era, and even this might almost seem too high an antiquity for this somewhat insignificant tract, which has only had a certain significance attached to it on account of its being ranked with the Veda.*

A decided advance in astronomical science was made through the discovery of the planets. The earliest mention of these occurs, perhaps, in the Taittiriya-Aranyaka, though this is still uncertain,²⁷¹ beyond this, they are not noticed in any other work of the Vedic period.²⁷² Manu's

* This is why it adheres to the old order of the lunar asterisms, as is done even at the present day in writings that bear upon the Veda. [According to the special examination of the various points here involved, in the introduction to my Essay on the Jyotisha (1862) a somewhat earlier term is possible assuming of course, as I there do, that those verses which betoken Greek influence do not really belong to the text as it originally stood. The author appears occasionally also under the name Lagadichārya, see above, p. 61, note.]

²⁷¹ The passages referred to are in fact, to be understood in a totally different sense, see *J St.*, ix. 363 x. 271.

²⁷² The Maatráyaṇī Up. forms the single exception but that only in its last two books described as *khila* see above notes 103 104. On the subject itself, see further my Essay

on the Jyotisha, p. 10 *J St.* ix. 363, 442 x. 239, 240.—The two Rik passages which are thought by Alf Ludwig, in his recently published *Nachrichten des Rig und Atharva-Veda über Geographie, etc., des alten Indiens*, to contain an allusion to the planets (i. 105 10, x. 55 3), can hardly have any such reference. Neither the Śātyáyana, cited by Śāyana to i. 105 10, nor Śāyana himself, has any thought of the planets here (see *J St.*, ix. 363 n.) For the 'drichard grahā' of Ath. S. 19 9. 7, the Ath. Parashikṣas offer other parallels, showing that here too the planets are not to be thought of; especially as immediately afterwards, in v. 10, the 'grahāś cāndramasāś dātṛyāś vāhūnāś' are enumerated where distinctly, the allusion is only to eclipses. This particular section of the Ath. S. (19 7) is, moreover, quite a late production, see *J St.*, iv. 433 n.

law-book is unacquainted with them, Yajñavalkya's Code, however—and this is significant as to the difference in age of these two works—inculcates their worship! in the dramas of Kālidāsa in the *Mṛcchhakatī* and the *Mahābhārata*, as well as the *Rāmāyaṇa*, they are repeatedly referred to*. Their names are peculiar, and of purely Indian origin, three of them are thereby designated as sons respectively of the Sun (Saturn), of the Earth (Mars) and of the Moon (Mercury), and the remaining two as representatives of the two oldest families of Rishis,—Aṅgiras (Jupiter) and Bṛigu (Venus). The last two names are probably connected with the fact that it was the adherents of the Atharva-Veda—which was likewise specially associated with the Rishis Aṅgiras and Bṛigu—who at this time took the lead in the cultivation of astronomy and astrology†. Besides these names others are also common; Mars, for example, is termed 'the Red,' Venus, 'the White' or 'Beaming,' Saturn, 'the Slow-travelling,' this last being the only one of the names that testifies to any real astronomical observation. To these seven planets (sun and moon being included) the Indians added two others, Rahu and Ketu, the 'head' and 'tail' respectively of the monster who is conceived to be the cause of the solar and lunar eclipses. The name of the former Rahu, first occurs in the *Chhandogyaopaniṣad*,²⁷³ though here it can hardly be taken in the sense of 'planet,' the latter, on the contrary, is first mentioned in Yajñavalkya. But this number nine is not the original number,—if indeed it be to the planets that the passage of the *Tuttirīya-Āraṇyaka*, above instanced, refers—as only seven (*sapta sūryāḥ*) are there mentioned. The term for planet, *graha*, 'the seizer,' is evidently of astrological origin, indeed, astrology was the focus in which astronomical inquiries generally converged and from which they drew light and animation after the practical exigencies of worship had been once for all satisfied. Whether the Hindus discovered the planets inde-

* In Pāṇ 17.2.26 *śukra* might be referred to the planet Śukra but it is preferable to take it in the sense of *Soma juice*.

† Wugoto Bhāṅgata came to ag-

nify 'an astrologer,' see Dada-kunda ed Wilson, p. 162 ff.

²⁷³ Cf. also Rāhula as the name of Buddha's son, who, however, also appears as Lāghu's, see *I St.*, vol. 130, 149.

pendently, or whether the knowledge came to them from without, cannot as yet be determined, but the systematic peculiarity of the nomenclature points in the meantime to the former view.²⁷⁴

It was, however, Greek influence that first infused a real life into Indian astronomy. This occupies a much more important position in relation to it than has hitherto been supposed, and the fact that this is so, *eo ipso* implies that Greek influence affected other branches of the literature as well, even though we may be unable at present directly to trace it elsewhere.²⁷⁵ Here it is necessary to insert a few particulars as to the relations of the Greeks with the Indians.

The invasion of the Panjab by Alexander was followed by the establishment of the Greek monarchies of Bactria, whose sway, in the period of their prime, extended, although only for a brief season, over the Panjab as far as Gujarat.²⁷⁶ Concurrently therewith, the first Seleucids, as well as the Ptolemies, frequently maintained direct relations, by means of ambassadors, with the court of Pataliputra,* and thus it comes that in the inscription

* Still it has to be remarked that in the Atharva Parāśihṭas, which, with the Jyotisha, represent the oldest remains of Indian astrology the sphere of influence of the planets appears in special connection with their Greek names, see *I St*, viii 413, x 319.

²⁷⁴ Cf. my paper, *Indische Beiträge zur Geschichte der Aussprüche des Griechischen in den Monatsberichten der Berl Acad*, 1871, p. 613 translated in *Ind Art q* ii 143 ff., 1873.

²⁷⁵ According to Goldstucker, the statement in the Mahābhārata as to a then recent siege of Śāketa (Oude) by a Yavana prince has reference to Menander; while the accounts in the Yuga Purāna of the Gārgi Samhitā even speak of an expedition of the Yavanas as far as Pātālputra. But then the question arises, whether by the Yavanas it is really the Greeks who are meant (see *I St* ii 348), or possibly merely their Indo-Scythian or other successors,

to whom the name was afterwards transferred, see *I St*, xii. 306, 307, also note 202 above.

* Thus Megasthenes was sent by Seleucus to Chandragupta (d. B. C. 291), Demetrius, again, by Antiochus, and Dionysius, and most probably Basilus also, by Ptolemy II to Ἀμυρραδῆς Amurraghāta, son of Chandragupta [Antiochus concluded an alliance with Σωφῆς ἑφῆς, Subhagaseṇa (?) Seleucus even gave Chandragupta his daughter to wife, Lassen, *I AK*, ii 208 Talboys Wheeler, *History of India* (1874), p. 177. In the retinue of this Greek princess there of course came to Pātālputra Greek damsels as her waiting maids, and these must have found particular favour in the eyes of the Indians, especially of their princes. For not only are ὑπερβαροὶ ἐδοῦναι πρὸς πᾶσι λαοῖς mentioned as an article of traffic for India, but in Indian inscriptions also we find Yavana girls

of Piyadasi we find mention of the names of Antigonus, Magas, Antiochus, Ptolemy, perhaps even of Alexander himself (cf p 179), ostensibly as vassals of the king, which is of course mere empty boasting. As the result of these embassies, the commercial intercourse between Alexandria and the west coast of India became particularly brisk, and the city of Ujjayinī, 'Οἰνύη, rose in consequence to a high pitch of prosperity. Philostratus, in his life of Apollonius of Tyana—a work written in the second century A.D., and based mainly on the accounts of Damis, a disciple of Apollonius, who accompanied the latter in his travels through India about the year 50 A.D.—mentions the high esteem in which Greek literature was held by the Brahmans, and that it was studied by almost all persons of the higher ranks (Reinaud, *Mém sur l'Inde*, pp 85, 87). This is not very high authority, it is true [cf Lassen, *I AK*, iii 358 ff], the statement may be an exaggeration, but still it accords with the data which we have now to adduce, and which can only be explained upon the supposition of a very lively intellectual interchange. For the Indian astronomers regularly speak of the Yavanas as their teachers but whether this also applies to Parāśara, who is reputed to be the oldest Indian astronomer, is still uncertain. To judge from the quotations, he computes by the lunar mansions, and would seem, accordingly, to stand upon an independent footing. But of Garga,* who passes for the next oldest astronomer,

specified attribute, while in Indian literature, and especially in Kāli dhāra, we are informed that Indian princes were waited upon by Yavanas, Lassen *I AK*, ii 551 957, 1159, and my Preface to the *Mālavikā*, p xlvii. The matter of these damsels being devoted to Eros, it is not a very far fetched conjecture that it may have been owing to their influence that the Hindu god of Love like the Greek Eros, bears a dolphin (makara) on his banner and like him, is the son of the goddess of Beauty, see *Z D M G*, xiv 269 (For makara = dolphin, see Journ. B. & E. R. A. S., v 33 34, *I Str*, ii, 169), and cf *li ther t St.*, ix, 380.]

* The name of Parāśara, as well as that of Garga, belongs only to the last stage of Vedic literature, to the Aranyakas and the Sūtras in the earlier works neither of the two names is mentioned. The family of the Parāśaras is represented with particular frequency in the later members of the *śaṅkha* of the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa—a Garga and a Parāśara are also named in the Anukramanī as Rishis of several hymns of the Rik and another Parāśara appears in Pāṇini as author of the *Bhāṣya* Sūtra see pp 143, 185 [The Gargas must have played a very important part at the time of the Mahābhāṣya, in the eyes of the author at all events, for on almost

an oft-quoted verse has come down to us, in which he extols the Yavanas on account of their astronomical knowledge. The epic tradition, again, gives as the earliest astronomer the Asura Maya, and asserts that to him the sun-god himself imparted the knowledge of the stars. I have already elsewhere (*I St.*, II, 243) expressed the conjecture that this 'Asura Maya' is identical with the 'Ptolemaios' of the Greeks, since this latter name, as we see from the inscriptions of Piyadasi, became in Indian 'Turamaya,' out of which the name 'Asura Maya' might very easily grow, and since, by the later tradition (that of the Jnana-bhaskara, for instance) this Maya is distinctly assigned to Romaka-pura* in the West. Lastly, of the five Siddhantas named as the earliest astronomical systems one—the Romaka-Siddhanta—is denoted, by its very name, as of Greek origin, while a second—the Paulīsa-Siddhanta—is expressly stated by Albirūnī† to have been composed by Paulus al Yūnānī, and is accordingly, perhaps, to be regarded as a translation of the *Εισαγωγή* of Paulus Alexandrinus²⁷⁷. The astronomers

every occasion when it is a question of a patronymic or other similar affix their name is introduced among those given as examples see *I St.*, XII, 410 ff. In the Atharva Pañcāṅgas also, we find Garga, Gārgya, Viddha Garga cited these latter Gargas are manifestly very closely related to the above mentioned Garga the astronomer. See further Kern Pref. to *Varāha Mihira's Brh. Samh.*, p. 31 ff., *I St.*, II, 347.]

* See my *Catal. of the Sansk. MSS. in the Berl. Lib.*, p. 258. In reference to the name Romaka I may make an observation in passing. Whereas in *Mahā Bhārata* XII, 10303, the Raumyas are said to have been created from the roma kupaḥ (hair pores) of Virabhadra, at the destruction of Dakṣha's sacrifice at the time of Rāmāyana I, 55, 3, their name must have been still unknown, since other tribes are there represented on a like occasion, as springing from the roma kupaḥ. Had the author been

acquainted with the name, he would scarcely have failed to make a similar use of it to that found in the *Mahā Bhārata*. [Cf. my *Essay on the Rāmāyana*, p. 23 ff.]

† Albirūnī resided a considerable time in India, in the following of Mahmūd of Ghazna, and acquired there a very accurate knowledge of Sanskrit and of Indian literature, of which he has left us a very valuable account, written A.D. 1031. Extracts from this highly important work were communicated by Reinaud in the *Journ. Asiat.* for 1844 and in his *Mém. sur l'Inde* in 1849 [also by Woepeke, *Ibid.*, 1863] the text promised so long ago as 1843 and not eagerly looked for ever since has, unfortunately, not as yet appeared. [Ed. Sachau, of Vienna, is at present engaged in editing it and, from his energy we may now at length expect that this grievous want will be speedily supplied.]

²⁷⁷ Such a direct connection of the Paulīsa Siddhanta with the *Εισαγωγή* is attended with difficulty,

and astronomical works just instanced—Garga, Maya, the Romaka-Siddhanta, and the Paulīsa-Siddhanta—are, it is true, known to us only through isolated quotations, and it might still be open to doubt, perhaps, whether in their case the presence of Greek influence can really be established; although the assertion, for instance, that Pulīsa, in opposition to Āryabhata,²⁷⁹ began the day at midnight, is of itself pretty conclusive as to his Western origin. But all doubt disappears when we look at the great mass of Greek words employed in his writings by Varāha Mihira, to whom Indian astronomers assigned, in Albirūnī's day, as they still do in our own,* the date 504 A.D.—employed, too, in a way which clearly indicates that they had long been in current use. Nay, one of his works—the *Hora-Sastra*—even bears a Greek title (from ὥρη), and in it he not only gives the entire list of the Greek names of the zodiacal signs and planets,† but he also directly employs several of the latter—namely, *Āra*, *Asphujit*, and *Kona*—side by side with the Indian names, and just as frequently as he does these. The signs of the

from the fact that the quotations from Pulīsa do not accord with it, being rather of an astronomical than an astrological description. That the *Εὐαγγελία*, however, was itself known to the Hindūs, in some form or other, finds support in the circumstance that it alone contains nearly the whole of the technical terms adopted by Indian astronomy from the Greek, see Kert's Preface to his edition of Varāha Mihira's *Bṛhat-Saṃh.*, p. 49.—Considerable interest attaches to the argument put forward by H. Jacobi in his tract, *De Astrologiæ Indiæ Hordæ Appellatæ Originibus* (Boon, 1872), to the effect that the system of the twelve mansions occurs first in Firmicus Maternus (A.D. 336–354), and that consequently the Indian Hord-texts, in which these are of such fundamental significance, can only have been composed at a still later date.

²⁷⁹ This, and not Āryabhata, is the proper spelling of his name, as is shown by the metre in his own

work (*Ganita-pāda*, v. 1). This was pointed out by Bhānu Dāśi in *J. R. A. S.*, 2, 392 (1864).

* See Colebrooke, II. 461 (415 ed. Cowell).

† These are the following *Στρυγας*, *Τάυρος ταύρος*, *Σύτταμα δίδυμος*, *Κούβηρα κίβωρος* (♉), *Λέγας λέων*, *Ράθωνας κροκόδειρος*, *Σάκκα ζυγός*, *Καυρπας σκορπιός*, *Ταυκσχήλα ραβδότης*, *Ακόκαρα αλγέκων*, *Ηπιδρογας υδροχόος*, *Ιτ'ήλα ιχθύς*, further, *Ηέλιος*, *Ηέλιος Ηέλιος*, *Ερμης*, *Αρα Αρης*, *Κονι Κρόνος*, *Στραν Ζευς*, *Ασφουγιτ*, *Ασφουδιτη*. These names were made known so long ago as 1827 by C. M. Whish, in the first part of the *Transactions of the Literary Society of Madras*, and have since been frequently published, see in particular Lassen, in *Zeitsch. f. d. Kunde des Morg.*, 17, 306, 318 (1842), lately again in my *Catal. of the Sansk. MSS. in the Berl. Lib.*, p. 338.—*Hordæ* and *Lenæra* had long previously been identified by Père Pons with ὥρη and ἑσπερος see *Lettres Édif.*, 26, 235, 237, Paris, 1743.

zodiac, on the contrary, he usually designates by their Sanskrit names, which are translated from the Greek. He has in constant use, too, the following technical terms, all of which are found employed in the same sense in the *Εισαγωγή* of Paulus Alexandrinus, viz,* *drilána* = *εἰκάνος* *leptá* = *λεπτή* *anaphá* = *ἀναφή*, *sunaphá* = *συναφή*, *durudhará* = *δορυφορία*, *kemadrutma* (for *krema-dutma*) = *χρηματισμός*,²⁷⁹ *tesí* = *φάσις*, *kendra* = *κεντρον*, *áproklíma* = *ἀποκλίμα*, *panaphará* = *εταναφορά* *tríhona* = *τρίγωνος*, *hibúka* = *ὑπόγειον*, *jámitra* = *διάμετρον*, *dyutata* = *δυτόν*, *meshurana* = *μεσουρανῆμα*

Although most of these names denote astrological relations, still, on the other hand, in the division of the heavens into zodiacal signs, *decans*, and degrees, they comprise all that the Hindus lacked, and that was necessary to enable them to cultivate astronomy in a scientific spirit. And accordingly we find that they turned these Greek aids to good account, rectifying, in the first place, the order of their lunar asterisms, which was no longer in accordance with reality so that the two which came last in the old order occupy the two first places in the new, and even, it would seem, in some points independently advancing astronomical science further than the Greeks themselves did. Their fame spread in turn to the West, and the Andubarius (or, probably, Ardubarius), whom the *Chronicon Paschale*† places in primeval times as the earliest Indian astronomer, is doubtless none other than Áryabhata the rival of Pulísa, who is likewise extolled by the Arabs under the name Arjabahr. For, during the eighth and ninth centuries, the Arabs were in astronomy the disciples of the Hindus, from whom they borrowed the lunar mansions in their new order, and whose *Siddhantas* (*Sindhends*) they frequently worked up and translated,—in part under the supervision of Indian astronomers themselves, whom the Khalifs of Bagdad, &c., invited to their courts. The same thing took place also

* See I St. ii 234.

²⁷⁹ *Ra hár* = *κερδερóμος* accord-
ing to Jacobs I c. To this list be-
long further the word *karya* =
κέρμα Kero I c. p. 20.

† The *Chronicon Paschale* nomi-

nally dates from the time of Con-
stantinus (330) it underwent how-
ever a fresh recension under Hera-
clius (610-641), and the name
Andubarius may have been intro-
duced then.

in regard to Algebra and Arithmetic in particular, in both of which, it appears, the Hindūs attained, quite independently,²⁵⁰ to a high degree of proficiency.²⁵¹ It is to them also that we owe the ingenious invention of the numerical symbols,* which in like manner passed from them to the

²⁵⁰ But cf. Colebrooke in his famous paper *On the Algebra of the Hindūs* (1817) in *Misc. Ess.*, ii 446, 401 ed. Cowell. Woepeke, indeed (*Mém. sur la propagation des Chiffres Indiens*, Paris, 1863, pp. 75-91), is of opinion that the account in the *Lahita Vistara* of the problem solved by Buddha on the occasion of his marriage examination, relative to the number of atoms in the length of a *yojana*, is the basis of the "Arenarius" of Archimedes (c. 287-212). But the age of the *Lahita Vistara* is by no means so well ascertained that the reverse might not equally well be the case, see *J. St.*, viii, 325, 326; Reinaud, *Mém. sur l'Inde*, p. 303.

²⁵¹ The oldest known traces of these occur, curiously, in Piṅgala's *Treatise on Prosody*, in the last chapter of which (presumably a later addition), the permutations of long and shorts possible in a metre with a fixed number of syllables are set forth in an enigmatical form, see *J. St.*, viii, 425 ff., 324-326.—On geometry the *Sulva-Sūtras*, appertaining to the *Śrauta ritual*, furnish highly remarkable information, see Thibaut's *Address to the Aryan Section of the London International Congress of Orientalists*, in the special number of *Trübner's American and Oriental Literary Record*, 1874, pp. 27, 28, according to which these *Sūtras* even contain attempts at squaring the circle.

* The Indian figures from 1-9 are abbreviated forms of the initial letters of the numerals themselves (cf. the similar notation of the musical tones); the zero too, has arisen out of the first letter of the word *śunya*, 'empty' [it occurs even in Piṅgala, l. c.] It is the decimal

place value of these figures which gives them their special significance. Woepeke in his above-quoted *Mém. sur la propagation des Chiffres Indiens* (*Journ. Asiat.*, 1863), is of opinion that even prior to their adoption by the Arabs they had been obtained from India by the Neo-Pythagoreans of Alexandria, and that the so-called Gobar figures are traceable to them. But against this it has to be remarked that the figures in question are only one of the latest stages of Indian numerical notation, and that a great many other notations preceded them. According to Edward Thomas, in the *Journ. Asiat.* for the same year (1863) the earliest instances of the use of these figures belong to the middle of the seventh century, whereas the employment of the older numerical symbols is demonstrable from the fourth century downwards. See also *J. St.*, viii, 265, 266. The character of the Volabhi Plates seems to be that whose letters most closely approach the forms of the figures. Burnell has quite recently, in his *Elem. S. Ind. Pal.*, p. 46 ff., questioned altogether the connection of the figures with the first letters of the numerals, and he supposes them or rather the older "Cave Numerals," from which he directly derives them, to have been introduced from Alexandria "together with Greek Astrology." In this I cannot in the meantime agree with him, see my remarks in the *Jenaer L. Z.* 1875 No. 24, p. 410. Amongst other things, I there call special attention to the circumstance that Hermann Hankel in his excellent work (*Späthumous unfortunatior*) *Zur Geschichte der Mathematik* (1874) p. 329 ff., declares Woepeke's opinion

Arabs, and from these again to European scholars²⁸². By these latter who were the disciples of the Arabs, frequent allusion is made to the Indians, and uniformly in terms of high esteem and one Sanskrit word even—*uchcha*, signifying the apex of a planet's orbit—has passed, though in a form somewhat difficult to recognise (*aux*, genit. *angis*), into the Latin translations of Arabian astronomers²⁸³ (see Reinaud, p. 325).

As regards the age and order of sequence of the various Indian astronomers, of whom works or fragments of works still survive, we do not even here escape from the uncertainty which everywhere throughout Indian literature attends questions of the kind. At their head stands the Āryabhata already mentioned, of whose writings we possess at present only a few sorry scraps, though possibly fuller fragments may yet in course of time be recovered²⁸⁴. He appears to have been a contemporary of Puliśa, and, in any case, he was indebted to Greek influence, since he reckons by the zodiacal signs. According to Albīrūnī, he

to the effect that the Neo Pythagoreans were acquainted with the new figures having place value and with the zero to be erroneous, and the entire passage in Boethius on which this opinion is grounded to be an interpolation of the tenth or eleventh century].

²⁸² See also Woepeke, *Sur l'Introduction de l'Arithmétique Indienne en Occident* (Pome, 1859).

²⁸³ As also according to Reinaud's ingenious conjecture (p. 373 ff.) the name of Ujjayini itself—through a misreading namely of the Arabic *أري* as *Arin* *Arin*, whereby the meridian of Ujjayini became the *coupole d'Arin*.

²⁸⁴ The researches of Whitney in *Journ. Am. Or. Soc.* vi. 560 ff. (1860) and of Bhāu Dājī in *J. R. A. S.* i. 392 ff. (1865) have brought us full light upon this point. From these it appears that of Āryabhata there are still extant the *Daśagiti Sūtra* and the *Āryabhaṭasāra*, both of which have been already edited by Kern (1874) under the title *Āryabhaṭasūtra*

together with the commentary of Paramāśivara of A. Barth in the *Revue Critique* 1875, pp. 241-253. According to his own account therein given Āryabhata was born A.D. 476, lived in Eastern India at Kuṣmāpura (Palibothra) and composed this work at the early age of twenty-three. In it he teaches, amongst other things, a quite peculiar numerical notation by means of letters.—The larger work extant under the title *Ārya Śiddhānta* in eighteen *adhyaayas* is evidently a subsequent production, see Hall in *Journ. Am. Or. Soc.* vi. 556 (1860) and Aufrecht, *Catalogus*, pp. 325-326. Bentley thinks it was not composed until A.D. 1322 and Bhāu Dājī, *l.c.*, pp. 393, 394, believes Bentley 'was here for once correct.'—Wilson *Met. Coll.* i. 119 and Lassen, *I. A. K.*, ii. 1136 speak also of a commentary by Āryabhata on the *Sūrya Siddhānta* this is doubtless to be ascribed to Lagha Āryabhata (Bhāu Dājī, p. 405). See also Kern Pref. to *Pub. Sinh.*, p. 59 ff.

was a native of Kusumapura, i.e., Pataliputra, and belonged consequently to the east of India. Together with him the authors of the following five Siddhantas are looked upon as ancient astronomers—namely the unknown* author of the *Brahma-Siddhanta* or *Pañdmaha-Siddhanta*, next, the author of the *Saura-Siddhanta*, who is called *Lāṭ* by *Albīrūnī*, and may possibly be identical with the *Lagata*, *Lagadha* mentioned as author of the *Vedaṅga* treatise *Jyotiṣa*, as well as with *Lādha*, a writer occasionally quoted by *Brahmagupta*,† further, *Paulīśa*, author of the *Paulīśa-Siddhanta*, and lastly, *Srīshena* and *Vishnuchandra*, to whom the *Romaka-Siddhanta* and the *Vasīṣṭha-Siddhanta*—works said to be based upon *Āryabhaṭa*'s system²⁸⁵—are respectively attributed. Of these five Siddhantas, not one seems to have survived. There exist works, it is true, bearing the names *Brahma-Siddhanta*, *Vasīṣṭha-Siddhanta*, *Sūrya-Siddhanta* and *Romaka-Siddhanta*, but that these are not the ancient works so entitled appears from the fact that the quotations from the latter, preserved to us by the scholiasts, are not contained in them.²⁸⁶ In point of fact, three distinct *Vasīṣṭha-Siddhantas*, and, similarly, three distinct *Brahma-Siddhantas*,

* *Albīrūnī* names *Brahmagupta* as the author of this *Brahma-Siddhanta* but this is erroneous. Perhaps *Reinaud* has misunderstood the passage (p. 332).

† *Lādha* may very well have arisen out of *Lagadha*, [the form *Lāṭa*, however see *Kern*, Pref. to *Bṛh. Samh.*, p. 53 points rather to *Anarāṭ*].

²⁸⁵ As also upon *Lāṭa*, *Vasīṣṭha*, and *Vijayanaudin*, according to *Bhāṣa Dīpī*, l. c., p. 408. In the latter's opinion the *Romaka-Siddhanta* is to be assigned to *Sāke* 427 (A.D. 505) and was "composed in accordance with the work of some Roman or Greek author." *Bhaṭṭapālā* likewise mentions, amongst others a *Yavonśvara Sphujidbrāja* (or *Asph*), a name in which *Bhāṣa Dīpī* looks for a *Speusippus* but *Kern* (Pref. to *Bṛh. Samh.*, p. 48) for an *Aphrodisius*.

²⁸⁶ See, on this point *Kern* Pref. to *Bṛh. Samh.* pp. 43-50. Up to

the present only the *Sūrya Siddhanta* has been published, with *Rāṅgānātha*'s commentary, in the *Bibl. Ind.* (1854-59), ed. by *Fitzedward Hall* and *Bīpū Deva Śāstrī*, also a translation by the latter, *ibid.* (1860, 1861). Simultaneously there appeared in the *Journ. Am. Or. Soc.*, vol. vi., a translation, nominally by *Ed. Burgess*, with an excellent and very thorough commentary by *W. D. Whitney*, who has recently (see *Oriental and Linguistic Studies*, ii. 360) assumed "the entire responsibility for that publication in all its parts." In his view p. 326, the *Sūrya Siddhanta* is "one of the most ancient and original of the works which present the modern astronomical science of the Hindus" but how far the existing text is identical in substance and extent with that of the original *Sūrya Siddhanta* is for the present doubtful. Cf. *Kern*, l. c., pp. 44-46.

are cited. One of these last, which expressly purports to be a recast* of an earlier work, has for its author Brahmagupta whose date according to Albirûnî, is the year A.D. 664, which corresponds pretty closely with the date assigned to him by the modern astronomers of Ujjayini, A.D. 628²⁸⁷. To him also belongs, according to Albirûnî,† a work named *Ahargana*, corrupted by the Arabs into *Arkand*. This *Arkand*, the *Sindhenda* (i.e., the five *Siddhantas*), and the system of *Arjabahr* (*Āryabhata*) were the works which, as already remarked, were principally studied and in part translated by the Arabs in the eighth and ninth centuries.—On the other hand, the Arabs do not mention Varaha-Mihira, although he was prior to Brahmagupta, as the latter repeatedly alludes to him, and although he gathered up the teaching of these five *Siddhantas* in a work which is hence styled by the commentators *Pañchasiddhāntikā*, but which he himself calls by the name *Karana*. This work seems to have perished,²⁸⁹ and only the astrological works of Varaha-Mihira have come down to us—namely, the *Samhitā*‡ and the *Horā Śāstra*. The latter, however, is

* Albirûnî gives a notice of the contents of this recast: it and the *Pancha Siddhanta* were the only two of these *Siddhantas* he was able to procure.

† This latter date is based on his own words in the *Brāhmasphuṭa Siddhānta*, 24. 7. 8, which, as there stated he composed 550 years after the *Saka-vijaya* (i.e., 1026) at the age of thirty. He here calls himself the son of Jishnu and he lived under Śrī Vyāghramukha of the Śrī Chāpa dynasty. Bhāṣa Dīpī 1 c p. 410. Prithūdakaśālini, his scholast, describes him curiously as Bhūta Mālavakāchīrya, see *Z. D. M. G.* xiv 650, *J. St.* xiii 316. Chāpa xii (*ganita* arithmetic) and xviii (*kuffaka* algebra) of his work have it as well known been translated by Colebrooke (1817).

‡ Reinsud, *Vien. sur* (*Inde*, p. 322).

289 Ye tendry I heard of a second MS. of the *Panchasiddhāntikā*.

Buhler's letter of 1st April 1875. See now Buhler's special report on the *Panchasiddhāntikā* in *Ind. Antiq.*, iv 316.

‡ In a double edition as *Bṛhat Samhitā* and as *Samāsa Samhitā*. Of the former Albirûnî gives us some extracts, see also my *Catal. of the Sansk. MSS. in the Brit. Lib.* pp. 233-254. [For an excellent edition of the *Bṛhat Samhitā* (*Bibl. Ind.*, 1864-65) we are indebted to Kern, who is also publishing a translation of it (chaps. i-ixxiv thus far) in the *Journ. R. A. S.* iv-vi (1870-74). There also exists an excellent commentary on it by Bhāṭṭotpala, drawn up Sale 883 (A.D. 966) and distinguished by its exceedingly copious quotations or parallel passages from Varaha Mihira's predecessors. In the *Bṛhat Jātaka*, 26. 5, the latter calls himself the son of Adityadisa and an *Āvāntika* or native of *Āvānta*, i.e., Ujjayini.]

incomplete, only one-third of it being extant.* He mentions a great number of predecessors, whose names are in part only known to us through him, for instance, Maya and the Yavanas (frequently), Paraśara, Maniṭha,²⁰ Śaktipūrva, Vishnugupta,† Devasvamin, Siddhasena, Vajra Jivaśarman, Satya,²⁰ &c. Of Āryabhata no direct mention is made, possibly for the reason that he did nothing for astrology in the Karana he would naturally be mentioned.²¹ While Āryabhata still computes by the era of Yudhishtira, Varaha-Mihira employs the *Śaka-lāla*, *Śaka-bhūpa-kāla*, or *Śakendra-lāla*, the era of the Śaka king, which is referred by his scholiast to Vikrama's era.²² Brahmagupta, on the contrary, reckons by the *Śaka-nripānta*—which, according to him, took place in the year 3179 of the Kali age—that is to say, by the era of Śalivahana.—The tradition as to the date of Varaha-Mihira has already been given as the statements of the astronomers of to-day correspond with those current in Albirūnī's time, we may reasonably take them as trustworthy, and accord-

* Namely, the Jātaka portion (that relating to nativities) alone, and this in a double arrangement, as *Loghu-Jātaka* and as *Bṛhaj-Jātaka* the former was translated by Albirūnī into Arabic [The text of the first two chapas. was published by me, with translation, in *I St.*, ii. 277 the remainder was edited by Jacobs in his degree dissertation (1872) It was also published at Bombay in 1867 with Bhaṭṭotpala's commentary similarly, the *Bṛhaj-Jātaka* at Benares and Bombay Kern's Pref., p. 26 The text of the first three chapas. of the *Yātri* appeared, with translation in *I St.* x. 161 ff. The third part of the *Horā Śāstra*, the *Vidhā paśāla*, is still unedited.]

²⁰ This name I conjecture to represent Mapetho author of the *Apotelesmata*, and in this Kern agrees with me (Pref. to *Bṛh. Samh.*, p. 52).

† This is also a name of Chāṇakya, *Dakṣam.* 183. 5. ed. Wilson. (For a complete list and examination

of the names of teachers quoted in the *Bṛhat Samhitā*, among whom are Bṛhasparṣa and Karabhu, see Kern's Preface, p. 29 ff.)

²¹ Kern Preface, p. 51, remarks that, according to Utpala, he was also called Bhadatta but Aufrecht in his *Catalogus*, p. 329* has Bhadanta. In the *Jyotiṣa Śāhara*, Satya stands at the head of the ages at Vikrama's court see *Z D M G*, xii. 722, xiii. 400.

²² And as a matter of fact we find in Bhaṭṭotpala a quotation from this work in which he is mentioned see Kern, *J. R. A. S.* xx. 383 (1863), Bhaṭṭa Dāji, *I c.*, 406. In another such quotation Varāha Mihira refers to the year 427 of the Śaka kāla, and also to the Romaka Siddhanta and Pāṇḍita, Bhaṭṭa Dāji p. 407.

²³ This statement of Colebrooke's in 475 (428 ed. Cowell), cf. also Lassen *J. A. S.* ii. 50, is unfounded. According to Kern Preface, p. 6 ff. both in Varāha-Mihira and Utpala, only the so-called era of Śalivahana is meant.

ing to these he flourished in A.D. 504.²³³ Now this is at variance, on the one hand, with the tradition which regards him as one of the 'nine gems' of Vikrama's court, and which identifies the latter with king Bhoja,²³⁴ who reigned about A.D. 1050,²³⁵ and, on the other hand, also with the assertion of the astronomer Satananda, who, in the introduction to his *Bhasvatī-karana*, seemingly acknowledges himself to be the disciple of Mihira, and at the same time states that he composed this work *Śaka* 1021 (= A.D. 1099). This passage, however, is obscure, and may perhaps refer merely to the instruction drawn by the author from Mihira's writings,* otherwise we should have to admit the existence of a second Varaha-Mihira, who flourished in the middle of the eleventh century, that is, contemporaneously with Albīrūnī. Strange in that case that the latter should not have mentioned him!

After Varaha-Mihira and Brahmagupta various other astronomers distinguished themselves. Of these, the most eminent is Bhaskara, to the question of whose age, however, a peculiar difficulty attaches. According to his own account, he was born *Śaka* 1036 (A.D. 1114), and completed the *Siddhanta śiromaṇi* *Śaka* 1072 (A.D. 1150), and the *Karṇā-kutūhala* *Śaka* 1105 (A.D. 1183), and with this the modern astronomers agree, who assign to him the date *Śaka* 1072 (A.D. 1150).²³⁶ But Albīrūnī, who wrote in A.D.

²³³ Kern Preface, p. 3, thinks this is perhaps his birth year, the year of his death being given by Amaraśaśchastha on Brahmagupta, as *Śaka* 509 (A.D. 537).

²³⁴ This identification falls of course. If Varaha-Mihira really was one of the 'nine gems' of Vikrama's court, then this particular Vikrama must simply have reigned in the sixth century. But the preliminary question is whether he was one of these gems. See the statements of the *Jyotiṣvid āharana*, l. c.

²³⁵ See e.g., *Aufrecht Catalogus*, p. 327^b 328^a.

²³⁶ Moreover *Śaṅkara*, at the close of his work—in a fragment of it in the Chambers collection (see my *Chron. of the Cō-s*, MS. 37, p. 1.

Lib., p. 234)—seems to speak of himself as living *Śaka* 917 (A.D. 995). How is this contradiction to be explained? See Colebrooke, ii 390 [341 ed. Cowell]. The passage in question probably does not refer to the author's lifetime, unfortunately it is so uncertain that I do not understand its real meaning. As, however, there is mention immediately before of *hal* 4200 = A.D. 1099, exactly as in Colebrooke, this date is pretty well established.—The allusion to Mihira might possibly, as indicated by the scholiast Balabhadra, not refer to Varaha-Mihira at all, but merely to *mihira*, the sun.]

²³⁷ This also agrees with an inscription dated *Śaka* 1128 and relating to a grandson of Bhaskara, whose *Siddhanta-śiromaṇi* is here

1031 (that is, 83 years before Bhaskara's birth ?) not merely mentions him, but places his work—here called *Karana-sara*—132 years earlier, namely, in A D 899, so that there is a discrepancy of 284 years between the two accounts. I confess my inability to solve the riddle, so close is the coincidence as to the personage, that the *شقر* of Albirūnī is expressly described, like the real Bhāskara, as the son of Mahādeva*. But notwithstanding this, we have scarcely any alternative save to separate Albirūnī's *Bāshkar*, son of *Mahādē*, and author of the *Karana-sāra*, from *Bhāskara*, son of *Mahādeva*, and author of the *Karana-kutūhala*¹²⁰¹—more especially as, in addition to the discrepancy of date, there is this peculiar circumstance, that whereas Albirūnī usually represents the Indian *bh* by *b h*

also mentioned in terms of high honour, see *Bhāu Dāji l c* pp 411, 416. Again, in a passage from the *Siddhānta ś romanī*, which is cited by Mādhava in the *Kāla nirṇaya*, and which treats of the years having three intercalary months, the year of this description which fell *Saka kālē* 974 (A D 1052) is placed in the past, the year 1115, on the contrary (and also 1256, 1378), in the future—*Bhāskara's* *Līlāvati* (arithmetic) and *Vijā ganita* (algebra) have, it is well known, been translated by Colebrooke (1817), the former also by Taylor (1816), the latter by Strachey (1818). The *Ganitādhyāya* has been translated by Roer in the *Journ As S Bengal*, ix 153 ff (Lassen, *I AK*, iv 849), of the *Goldādhyāya* there is a translation by Lancelot Wilkinson in the *Bibl Ind* (1861-62). To Wilkinson we also owe an edition of the text of the *Goldādhyāya* and *Ganitādhyāya* (1842). The *Līlāvati* and *Vijā ganita* appeared in 1832-1834, likewise at Calcutta. Bāpū Deva Śās trī has also issued a complete edition (i) of the *Siddhānta ś romanī* (Benares 1866). Cf also Hermann Brockhaus *Ueber die Algebra des Bhāskara* Leipzig 1852 vol iv of the *Berichte der Aon Sachs Ges der Wissensch* pp 1-45

* Renaud, it is true, reads Mahā datta with *ت* instead of *ب*, but in Sanskrit this is an impossible form of name, as it gives no sense. [At the close of the *Goldādhyāya*, xii. 61, as well as of the *Karana kutūhala*, Bhāskara calls his father, not Mahādeva, but Mahādevara (which of course is in substance identical) and he is likewise so styled by Bhāskara's scholar *śaśikṛishṇa* see my *Catal of the Berl Sansk MSS*, pp 235, 237.]

¹²⁰¹ this is really the only possible way out of the dilemma. Either therefore, we have to think of that elder Bhāskara "who was at the head of the commentators of *Ārya bhāṣya*, and is repeatedly cited by Prithūdakasvāmīn, who was himself anterior to the author of the *Śiromani*," Colebrooke, ii 470 (423 ed Cowell), or else under Renaud's *شقر* (pp 335-337) there lurks not a Bhāskara at all, but perhaps a Pushkara. It is certainly strange, however, that he should be styled *شقر* and author of a *Karana sara*. Can it be that we have here to do with an interpolation in Albirūnī?

(e.g. *b-huṣ* = *bhūrja*, *balb-hadr* = *balabhadra*), and for the most part faithfully preserves the length of the vowels, neither of these is here done in the case of Bashkar, where, moreover, the *s* is changed into *sh*.

Bhāskara is the last star of Indian astronomy and arithmetic. After his day no further progress was made, and the astronomical science of the Hindūs became once more wholly centred in astrology, out of which it had originally sprung. In this last period, under the influence of their Moslem rulers, the Hindūs, in their turn, became the disciples of the Arabs, whose masters they had formerly been*. The same Alkindi who, in the ninth century, had written largely upon Indian astronomy and arithmetic (see Colebrooke, ii 513, Reinaud, p. 23) now in turn became an authority in the eyes of the Hindūs, who studied and translated his writings and those of his successors. This results indisputably from the numerous Arabic technical expressions which now appear side by side with the Greek terms dating from the earlier period. These latter, it is true, still retain their old position, and it is only for new ideas that new words are introduced, particularly in connection with the doctrine of the constellations, which had been developed by the Arabs to a high degree of perfection. Much about the same time, though in some cases perhaps rather earlier, these Arabic works were also translated into another language namely, into Latin, for the benefit of the European astrologers of the Middle Ages, and thus it comes that in their writings a number of the very same Arabic technical terms may be pointed out which occur in Indian works. Such *termini technici* of Indian astrology at this period are the following: + *mukārinā* مقارنة & conjunction, *mukābilā* مقابلة & opposition, *tarāʾi* تربيع □ quartile aspect *tasdi* تسديس

* Thence is even taken the name for astrology itself in this period, — namely, *tājika*, *tajila śāstra*, which is to be traced to the Persian تارى ≈ 'Arabic'

+ See *J. N.*, ii 263 ff. Most of these Arabic terms I know in the meantime only from mediæval Latin

translations, as no Arabic texts on astrology have been printed and the lexicons are very meagre in this respect. [Cf. now Otto Lothamer's paper *Al-Kindi als Astrolog* in the *Biographisch-Literarische Nachrichten* 1874, pp. 263-300 published in honour of Fleischer's jubilee.]

* sextile aspect, *tašlī* تثليث \triangle trine aspect, further *hadda* حد *fractio*, *mušallaha* مصالحة, *iktarāla* إقتال *perfectio*, *induvāra* إندوار *deterioratio*, *itthāsāla* and *muthāsāla* إئتصال and متصل *conjunctio*, *isarapha* and *mūsarīpha* إصراف and مصرف *disjunctio*, *nahla* (for *nahla*) نقل *translatio*, *yamayā* جمعة *congregatio*, *manāi* منع *prohibitio*, *kamvāla* قبول *receptio*, *garikamvāla* غير قبول *inreceptio*, *cahama* سهم *sors*, *inṭihā* and *muntihā* إنتهاء and منتهى *'crminus*, and several others that cannot yet be certainly identified.

The doctrine of Omens and Portents was, with the Indians, intimately linked with astrology from the earliest time*. Its origin may likewise be traced back to the ancient Vedic, nay, probably to some extent even to the primitive Indo Germanic period. It is found embodied, in particular, in the literature of the Atharva-Veda, as also in the Grihya-Sūtras of the other Vedas²⁰⁸. A prominent place is also accorded to it in the Samhitās of Varaha-Mihira, Narada, &c., and it has, besides, produced an independent literature of its own. The same fate has been shared in all respects by another branch of superstition—the arts, namely, of magic and conjuration. As the religious development of the Hindūs progressed, these found a more and more fruitful soil, so that they now, in fact, reign almost supreme. On these subjects, too, general treatises exist, as well as tracts on single topics belonging to them. Many of their notions have long been naturalised in the West, through the medium of the Indian fables and fairy tales which were so popular in the Middle Ages—those, for instance, of the purse (of *Fortunatus*), the league boots, the magic mirror, the magic ointment, the invisible cap, &c.²⁰⁹

²⁰⁸ Cf. my paper, *Zwei Vedische Texte über Omens und Portenta* (18, 9) containing the *Adbhuta Brāhmaṇa* and *adhy. xiii* of the *Kaṇḍika Sūtra*.

²⁰⁹ Some of these the invisible

cap, for instance, are probably to be traced to old mythological superstitious notions of the primitive Indo Germanic time. In the *Śīma Vidhāna Brāhmaṇa* (cf. Eburnell Pref. p. xiv), we have the purse of *Forti*

We have now to notice Medicine, as the fourth branch of the scientific literature

The beginnings of the healing art in Vedic times have been already glanced at (pp 29, 30) Here, again, it is the Atharva-Veda that occupies a special position in relation to it, and in whose literature its oldest fragments are found—fragments, however, of a rather sorry description, and limited mostly to spells and incantations²⁰⁰ The Indians themselves consider medicine as an Upaveda, whence they expressly entitle it *Ayur-Veda*,—by which term they do not understand any special work, as has been supposed. They derive it, as they do the Veda itself, immediately from the gods: as the oldest of human writers upon it they mention, first, Ātreya, then Agniveśa, then Charaka,²⁰¹ then Dhanvantari, and, lastly, his disciple

nator, p 94, see *Lit O St.* 1874. pp 423, 424.—Magic, further stands in a special relation to the sectarian Tantra texts, as well as to the Yoga doctrine. A work of some extent on this subject bears the name of Nāgārjuna, a name of high renown among the Buddhists see my *Catal of Ind. Berl. Sansk. MSS.*, p 270

²⁰⁰ See Virgil Grohmann's paper, *Medizinisches aus dem Atharva Veda mit besonderem Bezug auf den Takman* in *I St.*, ix. 331 ff. (1865) —*Sarpa-vidyā* (serpent-science) is mentioned in Śatap. Br. xiii., as a separate Veda, with sections entitled parvan, may it not have treated of medical matters also? At all events in the Aśval. Śr., *Vāṇa-vidyā* (science of poisons) is directly coupled with it. As to the contents of the *Vāyo-vidyā* (bird science), mentioned in the same passage of the Śat. Br., it is difficult to form a conjecture. These *Vidyā*-texts are referred to elsewhere also in the Śat. Br. (in xi. xiv) and appear there like the *Vaidyaka* in the Mahābhāṣya as ranking beside the Veda. A *Vārtika* to Pān. iv. 2. 60, teaches a special affix to denote the study of text, the names of which end in *vidyā* or *lakṣaṇa*, and we might almost suppose the

Pāṇini himself was acquainted with texts of this description. From what Pa-ṇyāsi states, besides birds and serpents, cattle and horses also formed the subject of such works. All the special data of this sort in the Mahābhāṣya point to practical observations from the line, and out of these, in course of time, a literature of natural history could have been developed, see *I St.* xi. 459–461. The *lakṣaṇa* mentioned in the Atharva-Parāśiṣṭas are either of a ceremonial or astrological meteorological purport while, on the other hand, the astrological *Saṃhitā* of Varāha Mihira for instance, contains much that may have been directly derived from the old *vidyā* and *lakṣaṇa*.

²⁰¹ In the Charaka *Saṃhitā* itself Bharaḍvāja (Punarvasu) happens to be listed as the disciple of Indra. Of his six disciples—Agniveśa, Bheṣa, Jātākarna, Parāśara, Hārīta, Kṣhārāpāni—Agniveśa first composed his tantra then the others theirs severally which they thereupon recited to Ātreya. To him the narration of the text is expressly referred for after the opening words of each *adhyaḥa* (*adhyaḥa* *āyurvidyā*) the recitation follows the phrase, “*iti lakṣaṇa lakṣaṇa*”

Suśruta The first three names belong specially to the two divisions of the Yajus, but only to the period of the Sūtras and the school-development of this Veda.³⁰⁰ The medical works bearing these titles can in no case therefore be of older date than this. How much later they ought to be placed is a point for the determination of which we have at present only the limit of the eighth century A.D., at the close of which, according to Ibn Berthar and Albīrūnī (Reinaud, p. 316), the work of Charaka, and, according to Ibn Abī Uṣairīah, the work of Suśruta also, were translated into Arabic. That Indian medicine had in Pāṇini's time already attained a certain degree of cultivation appears from the names of various diseases specified by him (iii. 3 108, v 2 129, &c), though nothing definite results from this. In the *gana* 'Kārtakaujapa' (to Pāṇini, vi 2 37) we find the 'Suśrutapārthavas' instanced among the last members, but it is uncertain what we have to understand by this expression. The *ganas*, moreover, prove nothing in regard to Pāṇini's time, and besides, it is quite possible that this particular Sūtra may not be Pāṇini's at all, but posterior to Patanjali, in whose *Mahābhāṣya*, according to the statement of the Calcutta scholar, it is not interpreted.³⁰¹ Dhanvantari is named in Manu's law-book and in the epic, but as the mythical physician of the gods, not as a human personage.³⁰² In the *Pāñchatantra* two physicians, Śāhhotra and Vatsya-

gārda Atreyaḥ." Quite as uniformly, however, it is stated in a closing verse at the end of each *adhyāya* that the work is a *tantra* composed by Agniśekhā and rearranged (*pratisamākṛita*) by Charaka.

³⁰⁰ The same thing applies substantially to the names mentioned in Charaka (see last note)—Bharadvāja Agniśekhā (Hulāśaveśa?), Jātākarna, Parāśara, Hārīta. And amongst the names of the sages who there appear as the associates of Bharadvāja, we find, besides those of the old Rishis, special mention amongst others, of Āśvalāyana, Bādhākāya Kātyāyana, Baijāvāpi, &c. As medical authorities are further cited, amongst others (see the St. Petersburg Dict. Supplement, vol

vi), Kṛśā, Sāṃkṛtyāyana, Bādhākāya, Kṛṣṇātreya.

³⁰¹ 'Sausruta' occurs in the *Bhāṣya*, is, however, expressly derived from *sutra*, not from Suśruta. Consequently neither this name nor the *Kuṭapa Sausruta* mentioned in another passage has anything to do with the Sūtra of medical writers, see I St., xii 462, 407. For the time of the author of the *Vārttikas* we have the fact of the three humours, *rāsa*, *pitta*, *kṛmān*, being already ranked together, I c., I 462.

³⁰² As such he appears in the verse so often mentioned already, which specifies him as one of the 'nine gems' at Vikrama's court, together with Kālidāsa and Vardāna Mibira; see *Jyotirvid Abharana*, I c.

yana * whose names are still cited even in our own day, are repeatedly mentioned ³⁰⁵ but although this work was translated into Pahlavi in the sixth century, it does not at all follow that everything now contained in it formed part of it then, unless we actually find it in this translation (that is, in the versions derived from it) † I am not aware of any other references to medical teachers or works, I may only add, that the chapter of the *Amarakosha* (u 6) on the human body and its diseases certainly presupposes an advanced cultivation of medical science

An approximate determination of the dates of the existing works ³⁰⁶ will only be possible when these have been subjected to a critical examination both in respect of their contents and language ‡ But we may even now dis-

* This form of name points us to the time of the production of the *Sūtra*, to Vātsya. [It is found in *Taitt Ar*, i 7 2 as patronymic of a *Pañchāpama*]

³⁰⁵ Śālihotra specialty is here veterinary medicine (his name itself signifies 'horse'), that of Vātsya yana the *ors arandi*. Of the former a work there is in London two different recensions see Dietz *Analecta Medica* p 153 (No 63) and p 156 (No 70) According to Sir H. M. Elliot's *Ind Index to the Hist of Mus Ind*, p 263 a work of the kind by this author was translated into Arabic in A.D. 1361. The *Kāma Sūtra*, also, of Vātsya yana which by Madhusūdana Sarasvati in the *Prasthānt bheda* is expressly classed with *Ajūr Veda* is still extant. This work, which, judging from the account of its contents given by Aufrecht in his *Catalogus*, p 215 ff., is of an extremely interesting character appeals, in *majorum gloriā* to most imposing ancient authorities—namely *Audślakṣi*, *Svataketo*, *Śābharaya Pāñchāla Gonardīya* (i.e. *Paṇṇali*, author of the *Mahābhāṣya*) *Gopikāpatra*, &c. It is also cited by *Sabandha* and *Samkara* himself is said to have written a commentary on it see Aufrecht *Catal Mus* p 256.

† This was rightly insisted upon by Bentley in opposition to Colebrooke who had adduced, as an argument to prove the age of Vātsya Mihira, the circumstance that he is mentioned in the *Pañchātānta* (this is the same passage which is also referred to in the *Vikrama Charitra*, see Roth, *Journ Asiat* Oct 1845, p 304) [here, it is true, in his Pref to the *Brih Samhitā*, pp 19 20 pronounces very decidedly against this objection of Bentley's but wrongly, as it seems to me for, according to Bentley's researches the present text of the *Pañchātānta* is a very late production, cf pp 221 240 above.]

³⁰⁶ According to Turnour, *Mahāvanas*, p 254, note the medical work there named in the text by the Singhalese king Buddhādāsa (A.D. 339) entitled *Sūrattha Saṅgaha*, is still in existence (in Sanskrit too) in Ceylon and is used by the native medical practitioners, see on this David in the *Transactions of the Philol Society* 1875 pp 76 78.

‡ The Tibetan *landjūr*, according to the accounts given of it contains a considerable number of medical writings, a circumstance not without importance for their chronology, Thus, C.oma Keross in the *Journ As Soc Beng* January 1825, gives

ness, as belonging to the realm of dreams, the naive views that have quite recently been advanced as to the age, for example, of the work bearing Suśruta's name.* In language and style, it and the works resembling it with which I am acquainted manifestly exhibit a certain affinity to the writings of Varāha-Mihira.³⁰⁶ "If then"—here I make use of Stenzler's† words—"internal grounds should render it probable that the system of medicine expounded in Suśruta has borrowed largely from the Greeks, there would be nothing at all surprising in such a circumstance so far as chronology is affected by it"³⁰⁷ But in the meantime, no such internal grounds whatever appear to exist on the contrary, there is much that seems to tell against the idea of any such Greek influence. In the first place, the Yavanas are never referred to as authorities, and amongst the individuals enumerated in the introduction as contemporaries of Suśruta,‡ there is not one whose name has a foreign sound§ Again the cultivation of medicine

the contents of a Tibetan work on medicine, which is put into the mouth of Śākyamuni and, to all appearance, is a translation of Suśruta or some similar work

* To wit, by Vullers and Hessler, by the former in an essay on Indian medicine in the periodical *Janus*, edited by Hanschel, by the latter in the preface to his so called translation of Suśruta [1844-50].

³⁰⁶ The Charaka Saṃhitā has rather higher pretensions to antiquity, its prose here and there reminds us of the style of the Śrauta-Sūtras

† From his examination of Vullers's view in the following number of *Janus*, ii 453 I may remark here that Wilson's words, also quoted by Wise in the Preface to his *System of Hindu Medicine* (Calc 1845), p xvii, have been utterly misunderstood by Vullers. Wilson fixes "as the most modern limit of our conjecture" the ninth or tenth century, *sc.*, *A.D.*, but Vullers takes it to be *B.C.*!! [Cf. now Wilson's *Works* ii 273 ed Rest]

³⁰⁷ This is evidently Poth's opinion

also (see *Z D M G*, xvii 441, 1872) Here, after expressing a wish that Indian medicine might be thoroughly dealt with by competent scholars he adds the remark, that "only a comparison of the principles of Indian with those of Greek medicine can enable us to judge of the origin, age and value of the former," and then further on (p 448), apropos of Charaka's injunctions as to the duties of the physician to his patient, he cites some remarkably coincident expressions from the oath of the Asklepiads.

‡ Hessler, indeed, does not perceive that they are proper names, but translates the words straight off

§ With the single exception perhaps of Paṇḍkalāvata, a name which at least seems to point to the North West, to Πανδαλαώτης [We are further pointed to the North West of India (cf the *Kamēstēthōle*) by the name of Bharadvāja Kapīśthala in the Charaka Saṃhitā, which, moreover, assigns to the neighbourhood of the Himavanta (videlicet *Himavatāh Jubbhe*) that gathering of sages, out of which came the

is by Susruta himself, as well as by other writers, expressly assigned to the city of Kāśī (Benares)—in the period, to be sure, of the mythical king Divodasa Dhanvantari,* an incarnation of Dhanvantari, the physician of the gods. And lastly, the weights and measures to be used by the physician are expressly enjoined to be either those employed in Magadha or those current in Kālīnga, whence we may fairly presume that it was in these eastern provinces which never came into close contact with the Greeks, that medicine received its special cultivation.

Moreover, considerable critical doubts arise as to the authenticity of the existing texts, since in the case of some of them we find several recensions cited. Thus Atri, whose work appears to have altogether perished, is also cited as *laghū-Atri*, *bṛhad-Atri*, Ātreya, similarly, as *bṛhad-Ātreya*, *ṛiddha-Ātreya*, *madhyama-Ātreya*, *kanishtha-Ātreya*, Susruta, also as *ṛiddha-Susruta*, Vagbhata, also as *ṛiddha-Vagbhata*, Hārīta, also as *ṛiddha-Hārīta*, Bhoja, also as *ṛiddha-Bhoja*—a state of things to which we have an exact parallel in the case of the astronomical Siddhantas (see pp 258, 259, and Colebrooke ii 391, 392), and also of the legal literature. The number of medical works and authors is extraordinarily large. The former are either systems embracing the whole domain of the science, or highly special investigations of single topics, or, lastly, vast compilations prepared in modern times under the patronage of kings and princes. The sum of knowledge embodied in their contents appears really to be most respectable. Many of the statements on dietetics and on the origin and diagnosis of diseases bespeak a very keen observation. In surgery, too, the Indians seem to have attained a special

instruction of Bharadvāja by Indra. Again, Agniveśa is himself, *ibid.*, i 13 comm. described as Chāndrabhāgin, and so probably (cf. *gana* 'Bhadrā' to Pāṇini iv 1 45) a society with the Chāndrabhāgin, one of the great rivers of the Panjāb. And lastly, there is also mentioned *ibid.*, i 12 iv 6, an ancient physician, *hankāyana*, probably the *hankah* or *haka* of the Arabs (see Reinaud, *op. cit.* p 314 ff.), who is

expressly termed *Vāṅka bhāṣaj*. We have already met with his name (p 153 above) amongst the teachers of the Atharva-Parasphuṭa.]

* Susruta is himself said, in the introduction, to have been a disciple of his. This assertion may, however, rest simply on a confusion of this Dhanvantari with the Dhanvantari who is given as one of the 'nine gems' of Vikrama's court,

proficiency,²⁰⁸ and in this department European surgeons might perhaps even at the present day still learn something from them, as indeed they have already borrowed from them the operation of rhinoplasty. The information, again, regarding the medicinal properties of minerals (especially precious stones and metals), of plants, and animal substances, and the chemical analysis and decomposition of these, covers certainly much that is valuable. Indeed, the branch of *Materia Medica* generally appears to be handled with great predilection, and this makes up to us in some measure at least for the absence of investigations in the field of natural science.²⁰⁹ On the diseases, &c., of horses and elephants also there exist very special monographs. For the rest, during the last few centuries medical science has suffered great detriment from the increasing prevalence of the notion, in itself a very ancient one, that diseases are but the result of transgressions and sins committed, and from the consequent very general substitution of fastings, alms, and gifts to the Brahmans, for real remedies.—An excellent general sketch of Indian medical science is given in Dr Wise's work, *Commentary on the Hindu System of Medicine*, which appeared at Calcutta in 1845.²¹⁰

The influence, which has been already glanced at, of Hindî medicine upon the Arabs in the first centuries of the Hijra was one of the very highest significance, and the Khalifs of Bagdad caused a considerable number of works upon the subject to be translated.* Now, as Ara-

²⁰⁸ See now as to this Wilson, *Works* iii 380 ff., ed Rost.

²⁰⁹ Cf. the remarks in note 300 on the *vidyâs* and the *vidyâs*.

²¹⁰ New ed 1860 (London). Cf. also two unfortunately short papers by Wilson *On the Medical and Surgical Science of the Hindus*, in vol. 1 of his *Essays on Sanskrit Literature*, collected by Dr Rost (1864, *Works* vol. I.). Up to the present only *Sûtrâta* has been published, by Madhusudana Gupta (Calc. 1835-36, new ed 1868) and by Jivânanda Vidyâgarâ (1873). An edition of *Charaka* has been begun by Gâkâdharâ Kavirâjâ (Calc. 1868-69), but unfortunately being weighted with a very prolix commentary by

the editor it makes but slow progress (Part 2, 1871, breaks off at adhy 5). It furnished the occasion for Roth's already mentioned monograph on *Charaka*, in which he communicates a few sections of the work in 8 ('How to become a doctor') and 1-29 ('The Dangler') in translation. From the *Bhela Samhitâ* (see note 301 above) Purnell in his *Elem. of S. Ind. Pat.*, p. 94 quotes a verse in a way (namely, as 31-4) which clearly indicates that he had access to an entire work of this name.

* See Gildemeister *Script. Arab. de rebus Indicis* pp. 9, 97. (Flügel following the *Fihrist al-Ulûm* in *D. II O.*, xi 148 ff. 325 ff. (1857).)

hian medicine constituted the chief authority and guiding principle of European physicians down to the seventeenth century, it directly follows—just as in the case of astronomy—that the Indians must have been held in high esteem by these latter, and indeed Charaka is repeatedly mentioned in the Latin translations of Avicenna (Ibn Sina), Rhazes (Al Rasi), and Serapion (Ibn Serabi) *

Besides *Āyur-veda*, medicine, the Hindús specify three other so called *Upavedas*—*Dhanur-veda*, *Gāndhāria veda*, and *Artha-śāstra*, i.e. the Art of War, Music, and the Formative Arts or Technical Arts generally, and, like *Āyur-veda*, these terms designate the respective branches of literature at large, not particular works

As teacher of the art of war, Viśvāmītra is mentioned, and the contents of his work are fully indicated, ³¹¹ the name Bharadvāja also occurs ³¹² But of this branch of literature hardly any direct monuments seem to have been preserved † Still, the *Nīti-Śāstras* and the Epic comprise many sections bearing quite specially upon the science of war, ³¹³ and the *Agni-Purāṇa*, in particular, is distinguished by its very copious treatment of the subject ³¹⁴

Music was from the very earliest times a favourite pursuit of the Hindús, as we may gather from the numerous allusions to musical instruments in the Vedic literature, but its reduction to a methodical system is, of course, of later date Possibly the *Nāṭya-Sūtras* mentioned in Pāṇini (see above, p 197) may have contained something of the

* See Poyle *On the Antiquity of Hindu Medicine* 1838

³¹¹ By Madhvasūdana Sarasvatī in the *Prasthāna bheda*, *J St*, i 10, 21

³¹² Where Bharadvāja can appear in such a position, I am not at present aware, perhaps we ought to read Bhīradvāja, i.e., Drona!

† With the exception of some works on the rearing of horses and elephants which may perhaps be classed here, although they more properly belong to medicine

³¹³ The *Kāmandakiya Nīti Śāstra* in nineteen chapters, to which this especially applies, has been published by

Rājendra Lāla Mitra in the *East Ind* (1849-61), with extracts, which, however, can't reach as far as the ninth chap. from the commentary entitled '*Uṇādhyaṃya nirapekṣā*' in style and matter it reminds us of the *Bṛhat Samhitā* of Varāha Mihira A work of like title and subject was taken to Java by the Hindús who emigrated thither, see *J St*, III, 145, but whether this emigration actually took place so early as the fourth century, as Rāj. L. M. supposes, is still very questionable

³¹⁴ See Wilson *On the Art of War* (Works, IV 290 ff)

kind, since music was specially associated with dancing. The earliest mention of the names of the seven notes of the musical scale occurs so far as we know at present in the so called Vedāṅgas—in the Chhandas³¹⁵ and the Śikṣā,³¹⁶ and they are further mentioned in one of the Atharvopanishads (the Garbha), which is, at least, not altogether modern. As author of the Gandharva-veda,* i.e., of a treatise on music, Bharata is named, and, besides him, also Īśvara, Pavana, Kalinatha,³¹⁷ Narada,³¹⁸ but of these the only existing remains appear to be the fragments cited in

³¹⁵ See on this *J. Sl.*, viii. 259-272. The designation of the seven notes by the initial letters of their names is also found here, in one recension of the text at least, *ibid.*, p. 256. According to Von Böhlen, *Das alte Indien* ii. 195 (1830), and Benfey, *Indien*, p. 299 (in *Erck and Gruber's Encyclopædie*, vol. xvii., 1840) this notation passed from the Hindūs to the Persians, and from these again to the Arabs, and was introduced into European music by Guido d'Arezzo at the beginning of the eleventh century. Corresponding to the Indian *sa ri ga ma pa dha ni* we have in Persian, along with the designation of the notes by the first seven letters of the alphabet (A-G), the scale *da re ris fa sa la be*, see Richardson and Johnson's *Pers. Dict.* s. v. *Durr-i-mufaṣṣal*.—Does the word *gamma*, *gamut*, Fr. *gamme*, which has been in use since the time of Guido d'Arezzo to express the musical scale itself come from the equivalent Sanskrit term *grāma* (Prākṛ. *gāman*), and so exhibit a direct trace of the Indian origin of the seven notes? See Ludwig Geiger's precisely opposite conjecture in his *Ursprung der Sprache* i. 453 (1868). The usual explanation of the word is, of course, that it is derived from the Γ (*gamma*) which designates the first of the twenty one notes of Guido's scale, and which was "known and in common if not universal use for more than a century before his time," see Ambros

Geschichte der Musik, ii. 151 (1864). 'There being already a *G* and a *g* in the upper octaves, it was necessary to employ the equivalent Greek letter for the corresponding lowest note.' The necessity for this is not, however, so very apparent, but, rather, in the selection of this term, and again in its direct employment in the sense of 'musical scale' a reminiscence of the Indian word may originally have had some influence, though Guido himself need not have been cognizant of it.

³¹⁶ And this not merely in the Śikṣā attributed to Pāṇini, but in the whole of the tracts belonging to this category, see my Essay on the *Pratijed-bhāṣa*, pp. 107-109, Haug, *Accents*, p. 59.

* This title is derived from the Gandharvas or celestial musicians.

³¹⁷ This name is also written Kalinātha (Kapila in Lassen, *II. AK.*, iv. 832, is probably a mistake), by Sir W. Jones *On the Musical Modes of the Hindus* in *As. Res.* iii. 329, and by Aufrecht, *Catalogus* p. 210. Bühler, however, *Catal. of MSS from Guy*, iv. 274, has the spelling given in the text. But, at any rate instead of Pavana, we must read 'Hanuman, son of Pavana.' For Bharata, see above p. 231.

³¹⁸ See the data from the Nārada śikṣā in Haug, *Über das Wesen des Ved. Accents*, p. 53. The 'gandharva' Nārada is probably originally only Cloud personified, see *J. Sl.*, i. 204, 453 ix. 2.

the scholia of the dramatic literature. Some of these writings were translated into Persian, and, perhaps even earlier, into Arabic. There are also various modern works on music. The whole subject, however, has been but little investigated.³¹⁹

As regards the third Upaveda, *Artha-Śāstra*, the Hindus, as is well known, have achieved great distinction in the technical arts, but less in the so-called formative arts. The literature of the subject is but very scantily represented, and is for the most part modern.

Painting, in the first place, appears in a very rudimentary stage. Portrait-painting, for which perspective is not required, seems to have succeeded best, as it is frequently alluded to in the dramas.^{319a} In Sculpture, on the contrary, no mean skill is discernible.³²⁰ Among the reliefs carved upon stone are many of great beauty, especially those depicting scenes from Buddha's life, Buddha being uniformly represented in purely human shape, free from mythological disfigurement—There exist various books of

³¹⁹ Besides Sir W. Jones &c, see also Patterson in vol. ix of the *Asiatic Researches* I. AK, iv 832, and more particularly the special notices in Aufrecht's *Catalogus* pp. 199–202. Śīrṅgadeva, author of the *Saṅgītoratnākara* cites as authorities Abhinavagupta, Kīrtidhara, Kōhala, Somadeva, he there treats not only of music especially singing but also of dancing gesticulation, &c.

^{319a} On modern painting see my Essay, *Ueber Krishna's Geburtstest* p. 341 ff.—It is noteworthy that the accounts of 'the manner of origin of the production of likenesses' at the close of Tāraṇātha's hist. of Buddhism (Schiefner, p. 278 ff.) expressly point to the time of Aśoka and Nāgārjuna as the most flourishing epoch of the Yākṣa and Nāga artists. In an address recently delivered to the St. Petersburg Academy (see the Bulletin of 25th Nov. 1875) Schiefner communicated from the Kāgyur some 'Anecdotes of Indian Artists,'

in which among other things, special reference is made to the Yavanas as excellent painters and craftsmen. On pictorial representations of the fight between Kansa and Kṛṣṇa see the data in the *Mahābhāṣya*, I St, xiii 354–489 and on likenesses of the gods for sale in Pāṇini's time Goldstucker's *Pāṇini*, p. 228 ff., I St, v 148 xiii 331.

³²⁰ Through the recent researches of Fergusson, Cunningham and Lepper the question has been raised whether Greek influence was not here also an important factor. Highly remarkable in this regard are for example the parallels between an image of the sun god in his chariot on a column at Buddhagayā and a well known figure of Phœbus Apollo as shown in Plate xxvii of Cunningham's *Archæological Survey of India*, vol. iii 97 (1873). The same type is also exhibited on a coin of the Bactrian king Plato, lately described by W. S. W. Vaux in the *Aurum Chronicle* xv 1–5 (1875).

instructions and treatises on the subject ³²¹ according to the accounts given of them, they deal for the most part with single topics, the construction of images of the gods, for example, but along with these are others on geometry and design in general.

A far higher degree of development was attained by Architecture, of which some most admirable monuments still remain—it received its chief cultivation at the hands of the Buddhists, as these required monasteries, topes (*stūpas*), and temples for their cult. It is not, indeed, improbable that our Western steeples owe their origin to an imitation of the Buddhist topes. But, on the other hand, in the most ancient Hindū edifices the presence of Greek influence ³²² is unmistakable ³²³ (See Benfey, *Indien*, pp 300–305) Architecture, accordingly, was often systematically

³²¹ E.g., also in Varāha Mihira's *Bṛhat Saṃhitā*, one chapter of which, on the construction of statues of the gods, is communicated from Al-Bīrūnī by Reinaud in his *Asém sur l'Inde*, p 419 ff. See also *J St.*, xiii 344–346.

³²² In the fifth vol., which has just appeared, of his *Archæological Survey of India* p 18; ff. Cunninghamham distinguishes an Indo-Persian style, the prevalence of which he assigns to the period of the Persian supremacy over the valley of the Indus (500–330) and three Indo-Greek styles, of which the Ionic prevailed in Takhlila, the Corinthian in Gandhāra, and the Doric in Kashmir. Rājendra Lāla Mitra, it is true, in vol 1 of his splendid work, *The Antiquities of Orissa* (1875) holds out patriotically against the idea of any Greek influence whatever on the development of Indian architecture, &c. (At p 25, by the way, my conjecture as to the connection between the Asura Maya, -Taramaya, and Ptolemaios, see above, p 253; *J St.*, ii 234, is stated in a sadly distorted form.) Looking at his plates, however, we have a distinct suggestion of Greek art, for example in the two

fountain nymphs in Plate xvi., No 46, while the Bryadere in Plate xxi., No 59 from the temple of Bhuvaneśvara, middle of seventh century (p 31), seems to be resting her right hand on a dolphin beside which a Cupid (!) is crouching, and might therefore very well be an imitation of some representation of Venus. (Cf Rāj. I. M., p 59.)

³²³ This does not mean that the Indians were not acquainted with stone building prior to the time of Alexander—an opinion which is confuted by Cunningham, *l c.*, in 98. The painful minuteness, indeed, with which the erection of brick altars is described in the Vedic sacrificial ritual (cf the Śulva Sūtras) might lead us to suppose that such structures were still at that time rare. But, on the one hand, this would take us back to a much earlier time than we are here speaking of; and, on the other, this scrupulous minuteness of description may simply be due to the circumstance that a specifically sacred structure is here in question, in connection with which therefore every single detail was of direct consequence.

treated of,³²³ and we find a considerable number of such works cited, some of which, as is customary in India, purport to proceed from the gods themselves, as from Viśvakarman,³²⁴ Sanatkumara, &c. In the Samhita of Varaha-Mihira, too, there is a tolerably long chapter devoted to architecture, though mainly in an astrological connection.

The skill of the Indians in the production of delicate woven fabrics, in the mixing of colours, the working of metals and precious stones, the preparation of essences,³²⁵ and in all manner of technical arts has from early times enjoyed a world-wide celebrity and for these subjects also we have the names of various treatises and monographs. Mention is likewise made of writings on cookery and every kind of requirement of domestic life, as dress, ornaments, the table, on games of every description, dice,* for ex-

³²³ See Lassen, *I AK*, iv 877. Rām Rāy's *Essay on the Architecture of the Hindus* (1834) is specially based on the *Mānava* in fifty-eight *adhyāya*, presumably composed in S India (p. 9). *Māyāmata* (Maya's system, on which see Rāj L M, *Notices*, ii 306), *Kāśyapa*, *Vaikhānasa*, and the *Sakalādhikāra* ascribed to Agastya were only secondarily consulted. The portion of the *Agni Purāṇa* published in the *Bibl Ind* treats not at all of the building of houses, temples, &c. The *Ratha Sūtra* and the *Vāsta Vidyā* are given by Śaṅkha (Schol. on *Kāty*, i 11) as the special rules for the *rathādhikāra*. The word *Sūtra dhāra* meaning line holder, builder signifies at the same time stage manager and here perhaps we have to think of the temporary erections that were required for the actors, spectators, &c, during the performance of dramas at the more important festivals. In this latter acceptance indeed the word might also possibly refer to the *Nata Sūtras* the observance of which had to be provided for by the *Sūtra-dhara*! See above, pp 198-199.

³²⁴ On a *Viśva karma prakāśa* and a *Viśvakarmīya Śilpa* see Jayendra Lal Mitra *Notices of Sansk MSS*,

³²⁵ The art of perfumery appears to have been already taught in a special *Sūtra* at the time of the *Bhāṣya*, of the observations in *I Ś*, xiii 462 on *Chāndanagandhika*, Pān iv 2 65, perhaps the *'dramam* (*'nāma śāstram*, *'kaiyāta*) *Bhāṣya* to Pān iv 2 104, belongs to this class also.

* In *I Ś*, i 10, I have translated, doubtless incorrectly the expression *chatuṣśaṣṭi-kalā śāstra* (cited in the *Prasthāna-bheda* as part of the *Artha śāstra*) by 'treatise on chess' referring the 64 *kalās* to the 64 squares of the chess board whereas according to *As Res* i 341 (Schlegel *Reflex. sur l'Étude des Langues asiat.*, p. 112), it signifies treatise on the 64 arts! In the *Dasa-kumāra*, however (p. 140 ed Wilson) the *chatuṣśaṣṭi-kalāpāṇa* is expressly distinguished from the *Artha śāstra*.

—See an enumeration of the 64 *kalās* from the *Śrīva* tantra in Rādhā kṛṣṇadeva's *Śāṭa-lālpa-drama*, v. (On the game of *Chatuṣ-aṅga* see now my papers in the *Monatsber der Berl Acad* 1872 pp 60 ff 502 ff., 1873, p 705 ff., 1874, p 21 ff., and also Dr Ant van der Laan's beautiful work *Geschichte des Schachspiels* (1874, 2 vols.)

ample, nay, even on the art of stealing—an art which, in fact, was reduced to a regular and complete system [cf Wilson, *Dśākhum*, p 69, on Karmisuta, and *Hindu Theatre* 1 63] A few of these writings have also been admitted into the Tibetan Tāndjur

From Poetry, Science, and Art, we now pass to Law, Custom, and Religious Worship, which are all three comprehended in the term 'Dharma, and whose literature is presented to us in the *Dharma-Sūtras* or *Smṛiti-Sūtras*. The connection of these works with the *Gṛhya-Sūtras* of Vedic literature has already been adverted to in the introduction (see pp 19, 20), where, too the conjecture is expressed that the consignment of the principles of law to writing may perhaps have been called forth by the growth of Buddhism, with the view of rigidly and securely fixing the system of caste distinctions rejected by the new faith, and of shielding the Brahmanical polity generally from innovation or decay In the most ancient of these works, accordingly—the Law-Book of *Manu*—we encounter this Brahmanical constitution in its full perfection The Brahman has now completely attained the goal from which, in the *Brahmanas*, he is not very far distant and stands as the born representative of Dēvī *īśa*, while, upon the other hand, the condition of the *Sūtras* is one of the utmost wretchedness and harshness The circumstance that the *Vaidehas* and the *Licchavis*, as Lassen no doubt rightly, conjectures for *Nichluvis*) are here numbered among the impure castes, is—as regards the former—certainly a sign that this work is long posterior to the *Satapatha-Brahmana*, where the *Vaidehas* appear as the leading representatives of Brahmanism The position allotted to this tribe as well as to the *Licchavis* may, perhaps, further be connected with the fact that according to Buddhist legends, the *Vaidehas* and especially

this Lakhavi family of them, exercised a material influence upon the growth of Buddhism. The posteriority of Manu to the whole body of Vedic literature appears, besides, from many other special indications, as, for instance, from the repeated mention of the several divisions of this literature, from the connection which subsists with some passages in the Upanishads, from the completion of the Yuga system and the triad of deities, as well as, generally, from the minute and nicely elaborated distribution and regulation of the whole of life, which are here presented to us.

I have likewise already remarked, that for judicial procedure proper, for the forms of justice, the connecting link is wanting between the Dharma-Sāstra of Manu and Vedic literature. That this code, however, is not to be regarded as the earliest work of its kind, is apparent from the very nature of the case, since the degree of perfection of the judicial procedure it describes justifies the assumption that at this topic had been frequently handled before.* The same conclusion seems, moreover, to follow from the fact of occasional direct reference being made to the views of predecessors, from the word 'Dharma-Sāstra' itself being familiar† as also from the circumstance that Patanjali, in his Mahabhashya on Panini, is acquainted with works bearing the name of Dharma-Sūtras[‡]. Whether remains of these connecting links may yet be recovered, is, for the present at least, doubtful.‡ For the domestic relations of the Hindus, on the contrary—for education, marriage, household economy, &c.—it is manifestly in the Grihya-Sūtras that we must look for the sources of the Dharma-Sāstras, and this, as I have also had frequent occasion

* See Stenzler in *I St.*, i 244 ff.

† Yet neither circumstance is strictly conclusive, as, considering the peculiar composition of the work, the several passages in question might perhaps be later additions.

‡ See now on this *I St.*, xiii 458, 459.

‡ Allusions to judicial cases are of very rare occurrence within the range of Vedic literature but where they do occur, they imply a process

with the precepts of Manu. So also, for example, a verse in Yaska's Nirukta, iii 4, concerning the disability of women to inherit, which, besides, directly appeals to 'Manuh Srāvambbhuvaḥ'. This is the first time that the latter is mentioned as a lawgiver. [See also Śāṅkhya Gṛh. ii 16. Apast. ii 16. 1, ed. Löhler. On Vedic phases of criminal law see Barnell, Pref. to *Sūtra* with an Br. p. xv, Lit. C. EL, i 74, p. 423.]

to observe (pp 58, 84, 102, 143), is the explanation of the circumstance that most of the names current as authors of Grihya Sūtras are at the same time given as authors of Dharma-Sūtras.* The distinction, as a commentator † remarks, is simply this, that the Grihya-Sūtras confine themselves to the points of difference of the various schools whereas the Dharma-Sūtras embody the precepts and obligations common to all.³⁷

* In the case of Manu, too, there would seem to have existed a Mānava Grihya Sūtra as its basis (†), and the reference to the great ancestor Manu would thus appear to be only a subsequent one (†). [This surmise of mine, expressed with diffidence here, above at pp 19, 102, and in *I St.*, i. 69, has since been generally accepted, and well, it is hoped, find full confirmation in the text of the Mān Grihyas, which has meanwhile actually come to light. I have already pointed out one instance of agreement in language with the Yajus texts, in the word *abhimānīkta*, see *I St.*, ii. 209, 210.]

† *Āśirka* on the Karma pradīpa of Kātyāyana.

³⁷ In his *Hist. of Anc. Sans. Lit.* (1859) Max Müller gave some account of the Dharma Sūtra of Apastamba, which is extant under the title *Sāmavedyāśāstra Sūtra*. He also characterised three of the Dharma Sūtras printed at Calcutta (the Gautama, Viṣṇu and Vasishṭha) as being Dharma Sūtras of a similar kind, expressing himself generally to the effect (p. 134) that all the metrical Dharma Sūtras we possess are but "more modern texts of earlier Sūtra works or kula-dharmas belonging originally to certain Vedic Chattras." (The only authority cited by him is Stenzler in *I St.*, i. 232, who, however, in his turn refers to my own earlier account, *ibid.* pp. 57, 69, 143.) Johantgen in his tract, *Ueber das Gesetzbuch des Manu* (1863) adopted precisely the same view (see, e.g., p. 113). Bühler finally, in the Introduction to the

Digest of Hindu Law, edited by him, jointly with R. West (vol. I, 1867), furnished us for the first time with more specific information as to these Dharma Sūtras, which connect themselves with, and in part directly belong to, the Vedic Sūtra stage. In the appendix to this work he likewise communicated various sections on the law of inheritance from the four Dharma Sūtras above mentioned, and that of Landhāyana. He also published separately, in 1868, the entire Sūtra of Apastamba, with extracts from Haradatta's commentary and an index of words (1871). This Sūtra, in point of fact, forms (see above, notes 103 and 109) two *grāntas* of the *Āp. Śrauta Sūtra*, and a similar remark applies to the Sūtra of Baudhāyana. According to Bühler's exposition, to the five Sūtras just named have to be added the small texts of this class consisting of prose and verse intermingled, which are ascribed to Usanas, Kaśyapa, and Bodhi, and, perhaps, also the Smṛitis of Nārāyaṇa and Śaṅkha. All the other existing Smṛitis on the contrary, bear a more modern character, and are either (1) mere verbal reductions of ancient Dharma Sūtras, or fragments of such reductions (to these belong our Manu and Yājñavalkya, as well as the Smṛitis of Nārāyaṇa, Parāśara, Likhitaṣṭhi, Saṃvarta) — or (2) secondary reductions of metrical Dharma Sūtras, — or (3) metrical versions of the Grihya Sūtras — or lastly, (4) forgeries of the Hindu sects. — The material in vol. I of Bühler and West's work has been

As regards the existing text of Manu, it cannot, apparently, have been extant in its present shape even at the period to which the later portions of the *Mahā-Bharata* belong. For although Manu is often cited in the epic in literal accordance with the text as we now have it, on the other hand, passages of Manu are just as often quoted there which, while they appear in our text, yet do so with considerable variations. Again, passages are there ascribed to Manu which are nowhere found in our collection, and even passages composed in a totally different metre. And, lastly, passages also occur frequently in the *Mahā-Bharata* which are not attributed to Manu at all, but which may nevertheless be read *verbatim* in our text.* Though we may doubtless here assign a large share of the blame to the writers making the quotations (we know from the commentaries how often mistakes have crept in through the habit of citing from memory), still, the fact that our text attained its present shape only after having been, perhaps repeatedly, recast, is patent from the numerous inconsistencies, additions, and repetitions it contains. In support of this conclusion, we have, further, not only the fabulous tradition to the effect that the text of Manu consisted originally of 100,000 *ślokas*, and was abridged, first to 12,000, and eventually to 4,000 *ślokas*†—a tradition which at least clearly displays a reminiscence of various remodellings of the text—but also the decisive fact that in the legal commentaries, in addition to Manu, a *Vṛddha-Manu* and a *Bṛāhman-Manu* are directly quoted,‡ and must therefore have been still extant at the time of these commentaries. But although we cannot determine, even approximately the date when our text of Manu received its present shape,§ there is little doubt that its contents,

utilised critically in its legal bearing, by Aurel Mayr, in his work, *Das indische Erbrecht* (Vienna, 1873) see on it *Lit. C. Bl.* 1874, p. 340 ff.

* See Holtzmann, *Über den griechischen Ursprung des indischen Thierkreises* p. 14. [As to Manu's position in Varāha Mihira, see Kern *Pref. to Āpāh Samh.* pp. 42, 43 and on a Pāli edition of Manu, *Recht in I. St.*, i. 315 ff.]

† Our present text contains only 2684 *ślokas*.

‡ See Stenzler, *l. c.* p. 235.

§ Jobantzen (pp. 86, 95) assumes as the latest limit for its composition the year B.C. 350 and as the earliest limit the 5th century. But this rests in great part upon his further assumption (p. 77) that the *Bṛāhmanas*, *Upanishads*, &c., known to us are all of later date—an assumption which is rendered in

compared with those of the other Dharma-Śāstras, are, on the whole, the most ancient, and that, consequently, it has been rightly placed by general tradition* at the head of this class of literature. The number of these other Dharma-Śāstras is considerable, amounting to fifty-six, and is raised to a much higher figure—namely, eighty—if we reckon the several redactions of the individual works that have so far come to our knowledge, and which are designated by the epithets *laghu*, *madhyama*, *brihat*, *priddha*†. When once the various texts are before us, their relative age will admit of being determined without great difficulty. It will be possible,‡ in particular, to characterise them according to the preponderance, or the entire absence, of one or other of the three constituent elements which make up the substance of Indian law, that is to say, according as they chiefly treat of domestic and civil duties, of the administration of justice, or of the regulations as to purification and penance. In Manu these three constituents are pretty much mixed up, but upon the whole they are discussed with equal fulness. The code of Yajñavalkya is divided into three books, according to the three topics, each book being of about the same extent. The other works of the class vary.

With regard to the code of Yajñavalkya, just mentioned—the only one of these works which with Manu is as yet generally accessible—its posteriority to Manu follows plainly enough, not only from this methodical distribution of its contents, but also from the circumstance § that

the highest degree doubtful by the remarks he himself makes in agreement with Müller and myself, upon the probable origin of the work from a Gṛhya-Sūtra of the Mānava school of the Black Yajus, as well as upon the various redactions it has undergone, and the relation of the work itself and the various schools of the Yajus to Buddhism (pp. 112, 113), &c. *J. S. R.*, ix. 278, 279.

* Which those Hindus who emigrated to Java also took with them.
† Eiblér, *L. c.* p. 13 ff., enumerates 78 Smṛtis and 30 different redactions of individual Smṛtis,—in all, a total of 114 such texts. To

these, however, we have still to add, for example, from his *Collection of MSS. from Gwalior*, vol. iii., the Smṛtis of Kokila, Goḥila, Śāryāruva, Lohu, and *vyādī's* Parāśara, *laghu*-Lophapala *laghu* Sankha, while to the collective titles purposefully omitted by him from his list—Chaturv. 10. Śrī, 10. Śrī (extracts from 24 and 36 Smṛtis), and *Syapara*—we have probably to add from the same source *Uśaśāstra* and *Shamparati*. The *Artha Smṛti* is also mentioned in the *Caṇḍī Smṛti*. *MSS. A. II. Proc.* 1874 p. 122.

‡ See Stenzler *L. c.* p. 254.

§ See Stenzler in the *Tril.* to his edition of Yajñavalkya, pp. 12–14.

it teaches the worship of Ganeś and the planets, the execution, upon metal plates, of deeds relating to grants of land, and the organisation of monasteries—all subjects which do not occur in *Manu*, while polemical references to the Buddhists, which in *Manu* are at least doubtful,³³⁰ are here unmistakable.³³¹ In the subjects, too, which are common to both, we note in Yājñavalkya an advance towards greater precision and stringency, and in individual instances, where the two present a substantial divergence, Yājñavalkya's standpoint is distinctly the later one. The earliest limit we can fix for this work is somewhere about the second century A.D., seeing that the word *nānaka* occurs in it to denote 'coin,' and this term, according to Wilson's conjecture, is taken from the coins of Kanerki, who reigned until A.D. 40.* Its latest limit, on the other hand, may be fixed about the sixth or seventh century, as, according to Wilson, passages from it are found in inscriptions of the tenth century in various parts of India, and the work itself must therefore date considerably earlier. Its second book reappears literally in the *Agni-Purāṇa*, whether adopted into the latter, or borrowed from it, cannot as yet be determined. Of this work also two recensions are distinguished, the one as *bṛhad-Yājñavalkya* the other as *vṛddha-Yājñavalkya* (see also Colebrooke, I. 103). As to its relation to the remaining

³³⁰ If by the *pravrajitas* in viii. 363 Buddhist *brahmacharins* be really meant as asserted by Kulluka then this particular precept—which puts the violation of their persons on the same footing with violence done to "other public women, and punishes the offence with a small fine only—is to be taken not merely, as Talboys Wheeler takes it (*History of India*, II. 383), as a bitter sarcasm, but also as evidence that the work was composed at a time when the Buddhist is had already really deteriorated of the remarks in a similar instance in regard to *Parasara* I. 82. v. 141.

³³¹ Cf. Johnston p. 112 113.

* See above, p. 205, the same applies also to the *Vṛddha Gautama* law book. (According to Jacob,

De Astrologia & Indica Originibus, p. 14, the statement in Yājñavalkya, I. 80 that coins must take place *east of the equator* rests upon an acquaintance with the Greek astrological doctrine of the 'twelve houses' (and, in fact, this is the sense in which the *Mitākṣarā* understands the passage), so that, in his opinion, Yājñavalkya cannot be placed earlier than the fourth century of our era. This interpretation, however, is not absolutely forced upon us, as *vāda* might equally well refer to one of the lunar phases or mansions which from an early period were regarded as auspicious for procreation and birth, see *Lit. C. BL.*, 1872, p. 787.]

codes, Stenzler, from the preface to whose edition the foregoing information is taken, is of opinion that it is antecedent to all of them,³²² and that, therefore, it marks the next stage after Manu.*

But in addition to the Dharma-Śāstras, which form the basis and chief part of the literature dealing with Law, Custom, and Worship, we have also to rank the great bulk of the epic poetry—the Mahā-Bharata, as well as the Rāmāyana—as belonging to this branch of literature, since in these works, as I remarked when discussing them, the didactic element far outweighs the epic. The Mahā-Bharata chiefly embraces instruction as to the duties of kings and of the military class, instruction which is given elsewhere also, namely, in the Niti-Śāstras and (apparently) in the Dhanur-Veda, but besides this, manifold other topics of the Hindū law are there discussed and expounded. The Puranas, on the contrary, chiefly contain regulations as to the worship of the gods by means of prayers, vows, fastings, votive offerings, gifts, pious foundations, pilgrimages, festivals, conformably to the shape which this worship successively assumed, and in this they are extensively supported by the Upapurāṇas and the Tantras.

Within the last few centuries there has further grown up a modern system of jurisprudence, or scientific legal literature, which compares and weighs one against another, the different views of the authors of the Dharma Śāstras. In particular, extensive compilations have been prepared, in great measure by the authority and under the auspices of various kings and princes, with a view to meet the prac-

³²² Müller has, it is true, claimed (see above note 327) for the Dharma-Śāstras of Vishnu, Gautama, and Yajñ the character of Dharma-Sūtras and Dubler (pp. xxi-xxv) expressly adds to the list the similar texts attributed to Uśāna, Kaśyapa, and Budha and also, though with a reservation those of Hārta and Satikha (Vaśiṣṭha belongs probably to the Drāhyāyana school of the Sama Veda, see pp. 79-85—the Veda with which Gautama is likewise associated). Still, in

Dubler's opinion (p. xvii.) Manu and Yājñavalkya, although only "verifications of older Śātras," may yet very well be of higher antiquity "than some of the Śātra works which have come down to our times."

* Thus, to be sure, is at variance with 1. 4. 5, where twenty different Dharma Śāstra authors are enumerated (amongst them Yājñavalkya himself) these two verses are perhaps a later addition (f).

tical want of a sufficient legal code³³ The English themselves, also, have had a digest of this sort compiled, from which, as is well known, the commencement of Sanskrit studies dates These compilations were mostly drawn up in the Dekhan, which from the eleventh century was the refuge and centre of literary activity generally In Hindustan it had been substantially arrested by the inroads and ravages of the Muhammadans,* and it is only within the last three centuries that it has again returned thither, especially to Kāśī (Benares) and Bengal Some of the Mogul emperors, notably the great Akbar and his two successors, Jehangir and Shah Jehan†—who together reigned 1556–1656—were great patrons of Hindu literature

This brings us to the close of our general survey of Sanskrit literature, but we have still to speak of a very peculiar branch of it, whose existence only became known some twenty or thirty years ago, namely, the Buddhist Sanskrit works To this end, it is necessary, in the first place, to premise some account of the origin of Buddhism itself³⁴

³³ See Colclbrook's account of these in his two prefaces to the *Digest of Hindu Law* (1798) and the *Two Treatises on the Hindu Law of Inheritance* (1810), now in Cowell's edition of the *Misc. Ess.* i. 461 ff., also Bühler's Introduction, l. c., p. 111 ff.

* This finds expression e.g. in the following śloka of Vyāsa: 'Samprapto tu kalau lūle Vindhyaḍḍrattare s' 'ulā | bhūbhavāḥ gayānā hūḍḍ jyotiḥ sūtra parānmukhā ||' "In the Kali age the Brahmins dwelling north of the Vindhya are deprived of the sacrifice and averse from Jyotiḥ-āstra and in this

verse from another Dharma-sāstra: 'Vindhyaḥ sū dakṣiṇe bhāge yatra Godavari s' hūḍḍ | tatra vedas cha gayānā cha bhramṣyanti lalan yuge ||'

In the Kali age the Vedas and sacrifices will have their home to the south of the Vindhya in the region where flows the Godavari" Similar expressions occur in the Law book of Atri and in the Jagan-mohana

† As well as the latter's son, Dāra Shākob

³⁴ Cf. C. F. Koppen's excellent work *Die Religion des Buddha* (1857, 1859, 2 vols.)

Of the original signification of the word *buddha*, 'awakened' (sc from error), 'enlightened,' as a complimentary title given to sages in general,* I have already more than once spoken (pp 27, 167) I have also already remarked that the Buddhist doctrine was originally of purely philosophical tenor, identical with the system afterwards denominated the Sāmkhya, and that it only gradually grew up into a religion in consequence of one of its representatives having turned with it to the people† Buddhist tradition has itself preserved in individual traits a reminiscence of this origin of Buddha's doctrine, and of its posteriority to and dependence upon the Sāmkhya philosophy²³⁵ Thus it describes Buddha as born at Kapila-vastu, 'the abode of Kapila,' and uniformly assigns to Kapila, the reputed founder of the Sāmkhya system, a far earlier date. Again, it gives Māya-dévi as the mother of Buddha, and here we have an unmistakable reference to the Māya of the Sāmkhya.^{235a} Further, it makes Buddha, in his prior birth among the gods, bear the name Śvetaketu²³⁶—a name which, in the Śatapatha-Brahmana, is borne by one of the contemporaries of Kapila Patanjala, with whom Kapila ought probably to be connected And, lastly, it distinctly ranks Pāñchāsikha, one of the main propagators of Kapila's doctrine, as a demigod or Gandharva Of the names belonging to the teachers mentioned in Buddhist legend as contemporaries of Buddha, several also occur in Vedic

* The name *bhagavant*, which is also applied to Buddha in particular, is likewise a general title of honour, still preserved among the Brahmans to designate Rishis of every kind, and is bestowed very specially on Viṣṇu or Kṛiṣṇa, while in the contracted form, *bhagavān*, it actually supplies the place of the pronoun of the second person [*I St*, II 231, XIII 351, 352]

† See *I St*, I 435, 436, and above, pp

²³⁵ In the list of ancient sages at the beginning of the Charaka-Saṃhitā, we find mention amongst others, of a "Gautama Sāmkhyah"—an expression which the modern editor interprets, "Bauddhah eva Gautama vyāvṛtaye" But in truth

there might perhaps actually be here an early complimentary allusion to Buddha! A "Parīśhir (')bhukshur Atreya" is named shortly after

^{235a} Māya however, belongs not to the Sāmkhya, but specially to the Vedānta doctrine

²³⁶ Can the legend in the Mahā-Bhārata XII 2556, have any connection herewith—to the effect that Śvetaketu was disowned by his father Uddārika because of his being "mithyā viprān upaśāraṇ" i.—The name Śveta'ketu further occurs among the prior births of Buddha, No 370 in Westergaard's *Catalogus*, p 40, but amongst these 530 *jātā* as pretty nearly everything appears to be mentioned!

literature, but only in its third or Sūtra stage, *e.g.*, *Katyayana*, *Katyayaniputra*, *Kaundinya*, *Agnivesya*, *Matrayaniputra*, *Vatsiputra*,* *Paushkinasadi*, but no names of teachers belonging to the Brahmanic period are found in these legends³³⁷. This is all the more significant, as Buddhism originated in the same region and district to which we have to allot the *Satapatha-Brahmana* for instance—the country, namely, of the *Kosalas* and *Videhas*, among the *Sakyas* and *Lichhavis*. The *Sakyas* are the family of which Buddha himself came according to the legend,† they had immigrated from the west, from *Potala*, a city on the *Indus*. Whether this tradition be well founded or not, I am, at all events, disposed to connect them with the *Sakayanins* who are referred to in the tenth book of the *Satapatha-Brahmana* and also with the *Sakanyas* of the *Matrayana-Upanishad*, which latter work propounds precisely the Buddhistic doctrine of the vanity of the world &c (see above, pp 97, 137)³³⁸. Among the *Kosala-Videhas* this doctrine, and in connection with it the practice of subsistence upon alms as *Pravrajaka* or *Bhikshu*, had been thoroughly disseminated by *Yajnavalkya* and their king *Janaka*, and a fruitful soil had thereby been prepared for Buddhism (see pp 137, 147, 237). The doctrines promulgated by *Yajnavalkya* in the *Vrihad-Aranyaka* are in fact completely Buddhistic as also are those of the later *Atharvopaniṣads* belonging to the *Yoga* system. Nay, it would even seem as if Buddhist legend itself assigned Bud-

* To these names in *-putra*, which are peculiar to Buddhist legend and the names of the *Satapatha Brāhmaṇa*, belongs also, in the former, the name *Sāriputra*, *Sārikāputra*.

† Unless Buddha's preceptor *Arīḍa* may have something to do with the *Arāḍi Saujāta* of the *Ant Br vii 22* (!) The special conclusion to be based upon these name synchronisms is that the advent of Buddha is to be set down as contemporaneous with the latest effects of the *Brāhmaṇa* literature, *i.e.*, with the *Āranyakas* and older *Sūtras*, *I St.*, iii. 158 ff.

† See Csoma Kōrosi, *Journ. As. Soc. Benj.*, Aug. 1833, Wilson,

Asiana Antiq., p. 212. The truth of the legend may be questioned, but it not improbably intimates some connection with the *Sakas* or *Indo-Scythians* who were masters of *Patalene* subsequent to the Greek princes of *Bactria*. The legend may possibly have been invented in the time of *Kanerk*, one of these *Saka* kings, with a view to flatter him for the zeal he displayed on behalf of Buddhism.

³³⁸ So, too, *Johantgen Ueber das Gesetzbuch des Manu*, p. 112 refers the traces of Buddhistic notions exhibited in that work specially to the school of the *Mānavas* from which it sprang.

dha to a period exactly coincident with that of Janaka, and consequently of Yajnavalkya also, for it specifies a king Ajātasatru as a contemporary of Buddha, and a prince of this name appears in the Vṛihad-Āraṇyaka and the Kaushītaki-Upanishad as the contemporary and rival of Janaka³³⁹. The other particulars given in Buddhist legend as to the princes of that epoch have, it is true, nothing analogous to them in the works just mentioned, the Ajātasatru of the Buddhists, moreover, is styled prince of Magadha, whereas he of the Vṛihad-Āraṇyaka and the Kaushītaki-Upanishad appears as the sovereign of the Kāśī. (The name Ajātasatru occurs elsewhere also, *eg.*, as a title of Yudhisṭhira.) Still, there is the further circumstance that, in the fifth *kāṇḍa* of the Śatapatha-Brahmana, Bhadrāsena, the son of Ajātasatru, is cursed by Aruṇi, the contemporary of Janaka and Yajnavalkya (see *I St.*, 2, 213), and, as the Buddhists likewise cite a Bhadrāsena—at least, as the sixth successor of Ajātasatru—we might almost be tempted to suppose that the curse in question may have been called forth by the heterodox anti-brahmanical opinions of this Bhadrāsena. Nothing more precise can at present be made out, and it is possible that the two Ajātasatrus and the two Bhadrāsenas may simply be namesakes, and nothing more—as may be the case also with the Brahmadatta of the Vṛihad-Āraṇyaka and the two kings of the same name of Buddhist legend—It is, at any rate, significant enough that in these legends the name of the Kuru-Pāṇchalas no longer occurs, either as a compound or separately,³⁴⁰ whilst the Pandavas are placed in Buddha's time, and appear as a wild mountain tribe, living by marauding and plunder*. Buddha's teaching was mainly fostered in the district of Magadha, which, as an extreme border province, was perhaps never completely

³³⁹ Highly noteworthy also is the peculiar agreement between Buddhist legends and those of the Vṛihad-Āraṇyaka in regard to the six teachers whom Ajātasatru and Janaka had before they were instructed by Buddha and Yajnavalkya respectively, see *I St.*, iii. 156,

³⁴⁰ The Kurus are repeatedly

mentioned by the Southern Buddhists, see *I St.*, iii. 160 161.

* The allusion to the five Pāṇḍus in the introduction of the *Lalitā Viśāra* (Foucaux, p. 26) is probably, with the whole passage in which it occurs, an interpolation, being totally irreconcilable with the other references to the Pāṇḍavas contained in the work.

brahmanised, so that the native inhabitants always retained a kind of influence and now gladly seized the opportunity to rid themselves of the brahmanical hierarchy and the system of caste. The hostile allusions to these Magadhas in the *Atharva-Samhita* (see p 147—and in the thirtieth book of the *Vajasaneyi-Samhita*? pp 111, 112) might indeed possibly refer to their anti-brahmanical tendencies in times antecedent to Buddhism the similar allusions in the *Sama-Sūtras*, on the contrary (see p 79),³⁴¹ are only to be explained as referring to the actual flourishing of Buddhism in Magadha.*

With reference to the tradition as to Buddha's age, the various Buddhist eras which commence with the date of his death exhibit the widest divergence from each other. Amongst the Northern Buddhists fourteen different accounts are found, ranging from B.C. 2422 to B.C. 546, the eras of the Southern Buddhists, on the contrary, mostly agree with each other, and all of them start from B.C. 544 or 543. This latter chronology has been recently adopted as the correct one, on the ground that it accords best with historical conditions, although even it displays a discrepancy of sixty-six years as regards the historically authenticated date of Chandragupta. But the Northern Buddhists, the Tibetans as well as the Chinese—independently altogether of their era, which may be of later origin than this particular tradition†—agree in placing the reign of King Kanishka Kanerki, under whom the third (or fourth) Buddhist council was held, 400 years after Buddha's death, and on the evidence of coins, this Kanishka reigned down to A.D. 40 (see Lassen, *J.A.K.*, II. 412, 413), which would bring down the date of Buddha's death to about the year B.C. 370. Similarly, the Tibetans place Nagarjuna—who, according to the *Raja-tarangini*, was contemporaneous with Kanishka—400 years after the death of Buddha, whereas the Southern Buddhists make him live 500 years after that event. Nothing like

³⁴¹ And on another occasion in the *Bauddhāvāsa Sūtra* also, see note 126.

* For other points of contact in the later Vedic literature see pp. 129, 138 [98-99-151]. Lassen has drawn att. notice in *J.A.K.*, II. 79

to the Buddhist names of the mountains about Rājagṛha, the capital of Magadha, found in *Mahā Bhārata* II. 799.

† Which is met with so early as the seventh century A.D. in Hsuan Tsang

positive certainty, therefore, is for the present attainable.²¹² *A priori*, however, it seems probable that the council which was held in the reign of King Kanerka, and from which the existing shape of the sacred scriptures of the Northern Buddhists nominally dates, really took place 400, and not so much as 570, years after Buddha's death. It seems probable also that the Northern Buddhists, who alone possess these Scriptures complete, preserved more authentic information regarding the circumstances of the time of their redaction—and consequently also regarding the date of Nagarjuna—than did the Southern Buddhists, to whom this redaction is unknown, and whose scriptures exist only in a more ancient form which is alleged to have been brought to Ceylon so early as B.C. 245, and to have been there committed to writing about the year B.C. 80 (Lassen, *I AK*, II 435)—Of these various eras, the only one the actual employment of which at an early period can at present be proved is the Ceylonese, which, like the other Southern eras, begins in B.C. 544. Here the period indicated is the close of the fourth century A.D., since the *Dīpavaṃsa*, a history of Ceylon in Pali verse, which was written at that date, appears to make use of this era, whereby naturally it becomes invested with a certain authority.

If, now, we strip the accounts of Buddha's personality of all supernatural accretion, we find that he was a king's son, who, penetrated by the nothingness of earthly things, forsook his kindred in order thenceforth to live on alms, and devote himself in the first place to contemplation, and thereafter to the instruction of his fellow-men. His doctrine was,* that "men's lots in this life are conditioned and regulated by the actions of a previous existence, that no evil deed remains without punishment, and no good deed without reward. From this fate, which dominates the individual within the circle of transmigration, he can only

²¹² Nor have the subsequent discussions of this topic by Max Müller (1859), *HL. A S L* p. 264 ff. by Westergaard (1860) *Ueber Buddha's Todesjahr* (Breslau 1862) and by Kern, *Über die Jährtage der Zündel Buddhisten* (1874), so far yielded

any definite result, cf. my *I Str.*, II 216, *Lat. C Bl.*, 1874, p. 719.

* Though it is nowhere set forth in so succinct a form as results, however, as the sum and substance of the various legends.

escape* by directing his will towards the one thought of liberation from this circle, by remaining true to this aim, and striving with steadfast zeal after meritorious action only, whereby finally, having cast aside all passions, which are regarded as the strongest fetters in this prison-house of existence, he attains the desired goal of complete emancipation from re-birth" This teaching contains, in itself, absolutely nothing new, on the contrary, it is entirely identical with the corresponding Brahmanical doctrine, only the fashion in which Buddha proclaimed and disseminated it was something altogether novel and unwonted. For while the Brahmans taught solely in their hermitages, and received pupils of their own caste only, he wandered about the country with his disciples, preaching his doctrine to the whole people,† and—although still recognising the existing caste-system, and explaining its origin, as the Brahmans themselves did, by the dogma of rewards and punishments for prior actions—receiving as adherents men of every caste without distinction. To these he assigned rank in the community according to their age and understanding, thus abolishing within the community itself the social distinctions that birth entailed, and opening up to all men the prospect of emancipation from the trammels of their birth. This of itself sufficiently explains the enormous success that attended his doctrine: the oppressed all turned to him as their redeemer‡. If by this alone he struck at the root of the Brahmanical hierarchy, he did so not less by declar-

* See Schmidt *Deunglun der Weise und der Thor*, Pref., p. xxviii ff.

† See Lassen *I AK*, ii. 440. 441. Burnouf, *Introd. à l'Histoire du Bouddhisme Indien*, pp. 152-212.

‡ Under these circumstances, it is indeed surprising that it should have been possible to dislodge Buddhism from India. The great numbers and influence of the Brahman caste do not alone completely account for the fact: for, in proportion to the whole people, the Brahmans were after all only a very small

minority. My idea is that the strict morality required by Buddhism of its adherents became in the long run irksome to the people: the original cult, too, was probably too simple. The Brahmans knew how to turn both circumstances to the best advantage. Krishna-worship, as they organised it, offered far more satisfaction to the sensual tastes of the people: while the various cults of the Śākya or female deities most likely all date from a time shortly preceding the expulsion of the Buddhists from India.

ing sacrificial worship—the performance of which was the exclusive privilege of the Brahmans—to be utterly unavailing and worthless, and a virtuous disposition and virtuous conduct, on the contrary, to be the only real means of attaining final deliverance. He did so, further, by the fact that, wholly penetrated by the truth of his opinions, he claimed to be in possession of the highest enlightenment, and so by implication rejected the validity of the Veda as the supreme source of knowledge. These two doctrines also were in no way new, till then, however, they had been the possession of a few anchorites, never before had they been freely and publicly proclaimed to all.

Immediately after Buddha's death there was held, according to the tradition, a council of his disciples in Magadha, at which the Buddhist sacred scriptures were compiled. These consist of three divisions (*Pitakas*), the first of which—the *Sutras**—comprises utterances and discourses of Buddha himself, conversations with his hearers, while the *Vinaya* embraces rules of discipline, and the *Abhidharma*, dogmatic and philosophical discussions. A hundred years later, according to the tradition of the Southern, but a hundred and ten according to that of the Northern Buddhists, a second council took place at Pataliputra for the purpose of doing away with errors of discipline which had crept in. With regard to the third council, the accounts of the Northern and Southern Buddhists are at issue (Lassen, *I AK*, II. 232). According to the former, it was held in the seventeenth year of the reign of Aśoka, a year which we have to identify with B.C. 246—which, however, is utterly at variance with the equally traditional assertion that it took place 218 years after Buddha's death, i.e., in B.C. 326. At this council the precepts of the law were restored to their ancient purity, and it was at the same time resolved to send forth missionaries to propagate the doctrines of Buddha. The Northern Buddhists, on the contrary, place the third council 400 years after Buddha's death, in the reign of Kanishka, one

* The name alone might suggest the *Sātra*, not in the Brahmanic, but Buddha himself employed in period.

of the Turushka (Saka) kings of Kashmir, who, as we have seen, is established, on numismatic evidence, to have reigned until A D 40. The sacred scriptures of the Northern Buddhists which are alleged to have been fixed at this council, are still extant, not merely in the Sanskrit originals themselves, which have recently been recovered in Nepal,* but also in a complete Tibetan translation, bearing the name *Kāgyur*, and consisting of one hundred volumes,† as well as, partially at least, in Chinese, Mongolian, Kalmuck and other translations. The scriptures of the Southern Buddhists, on the contrary are not extant in Sanskrit at all. With reference to them, it is alleged that one year after their arrangement at the third council, that of Aśoka (i.e., in the year B C 245), they were brought by Mahendra, the apostle of Ceylon, to that island, and by him translated

* By the British Resident there, B H Hodgson, who presented MSS of them to the Asiatic Societies of Calcutta, London, and Paris. The latter collection was further enriched in 1837 with copies which the *Société Asiatique* caused to be made through Hodgson's agency. This led Furrouf to write his great work *Introduction à l'Histoire du Bouddhisme Indou* in Paris 1844 [followed in the end of 1852 by his not less important production, the translation of the *Lotos de la Pénée Lor*, see *J St* iii 135 ff., 1864]. The British Museum and the University Library in Cambridge are now also in possession of similar MSS. A catalogue compiled by Cowell and Eggeberg of the Hodgson collection of Buddhist Sanskrit MSS in the possession of the Royal Asiatic Society has just appeared.]

† Regarding the compass and contents of this Tibetan translation our first (and hitherto almost our sole) information was supplied by a Hungarian traveller Csoma Korosi the Anquetil du Perron of this century, a man of rare vigour and energy who resided for a very long time in Tibet, and who by his Tibetan grammar and dictionary has conquered this

language for European science. Two pretty extensive works from the *Kāgyur* have already been edited and translated: the *Dsanglun* in St Petersburg by Schmidt and the *Rgya Cher Aol Pa* (Lahita Vistara) in Paris by Foucaux. [Since then L. Fœr, especially, has rendered valuable service in this field by his *Textes inédits du Kandyon* (1864-71 11 parts), also Schiefner, e.g., by his editions of the *Yamala prāmottara rufnamāla* (1858)—the Sanskrit text of which was subsequently edited by Foucaux (cf also *J St* i 210 ff.)—and of the *Bharata Riksona* (1875). Schiefner has further just issued a translation from the *Kāgyur* of a group of Buddhist tales, under the title, *Mahātatyāna und König Tschanda Pradya*. The ninth of these stories contains (see p vii 26 ff.) what is now probably the oldest version of the so-called 'Philoopher's Rade,' which here, as in the *Paśchatantra* (iv 6) is related of the king himself, whereas in an Arabian tale of the ninth century communicated in the appendix (p 66) and in our own medieval version it is told of the king's wise councillor.

into the native Singhalese³⁴³ Not until some 165 years later (i.e., in B.C. 80) were they consigned to writing in that language, having been propagated in the interval by oral transmission only³⁴⁴ After a further period of 500 years (namely, between A.D. 410 and 432) they were at length rendered into the sacred Pāli tongue (cf. Lassen, *IAK*, II. 435), in which they are now extant, and from which in turn translations into several of the languages of Farther India were subsequently made.* As to the relation of these scriptures of the Southern Buddhists to those of their Northern co-religionists, little is at present known beyond the fact that both present in common the general division into three parts (*Sūtra, Vinaya, Abhidharma*). In extent they can hardly compare with the latter,³⁴⁵ nor even, according to the foregoing exposition,† in authenticity³⁴⁶ Unfortunately but little information has as yet

³⁴³ It was not the Pāli text itself but only the oral commentary (*aśāḥ katha*) belonging to it, which was translated into Singhalese (See the following notes). So at least it is stated in the tradition in the *Mahāvamsa*. For the rest, it is extremely doubtful how much of the present Tipitaka may have actually been in existence then. For if we compare the statements contained in the Lhabra missive—addressed by king Pyadasa to the synod of Magadha, which was then engaged in the accommodation of schisms that had sprung up—relative to the sacred texts (*dhamma paligaydani*) as they then stood a mighty difference becomes apparent! See Burnouf, *Lotus* p. 724 ff., *I St.*, III. 172 ff.

³⁴⁴ See *Mahāvamsa*, chap. XXIII. p. 207, Turnour, *Preface*, p. XXIX., *Muir Orig Sansk Texts*, II. 69, 70 (57³) *I St.* v. 26

* That is to say, translated back again (!) for this sacred language must on the same that Mahendra brought with him? [Not the texts themselves only their interpretation (*aśāḥ katha*) was now rendered back again into Pāli, namely by Buddhaghosha who came from Magadha, and resided a number of years in Ceylon.]

³⁴⁵ The extent of the Pāli Tipitaka is also very considerable, see the accounts in Hardy's *Eastern Monachism*, pp. 167–170. On the earliest mention of the name Tipitaka in a Sanskrit inscription of Buddha ghosha at Kanheri (in the *Journ. Bombay Br. R. A. S.*, v. 14), see *I St.* v. 26

† If indeed the case be as here represented! I can in the mean while only report. [Unfortunately, I had trusted to Lassen's account in the passage cited in the text, instead of referring to Turnour himself (pp. XXIX. XXX.), the true state of the case (see the preceding notes) I have set forth in *I St.*, III. 254.]

³⁴⁶ The question which of the two redactions, that of the Northern or that of the Southern Buddhists is the more original has been warmly debated by Turnour and Hodgson (The latter's articles on the subject are now collected in a convenient form in his *Essays on Languages Lit. and Pol. of Nepal and Tibet* 1874.) Burnouf also has discussed the question in his *Lotus de la Bonne Loi* p. 262 ff., and has decided in principle no doubt rightly, that he possesses an equal title. Compare here *I St.*, III. 176 ff., where certain

been imparted regarding their contents, &c.* Southern Buddhism, however, supplies us with copious and possibly trustworthy accounts of the first centuries of its existence, as well as of the growth of the Buddhist faith generally, a Pali historical literature having grown up in Ceylon at a comparatively early period,³⁴⁶ one of the most important works of which—the Mahavansa of Mahanama, composed towards A.D. 480—has already been published, both in the original text and in an English version

doubts are urged by me against some of his assumptions, as also specially with regard to Buddhaghosha's highly significant part in the shaping of the Pāli Tipitaka. Kern has recently in his *Essay Over de Jaar telling der zuidoelyke Buddhisten*, gone far beyond those objections of mine, but as it seems to me he goes further than the case requires, see *Lit. C. Bl.*, 1874 p. 719. At any rate, even fully acknowledging the part belonging to Buddhaghosha it appears to me now that the claim of the Pāli Tipitaka to superior originality is after all, far stronger than that of the Sanskrit texts of the Northern Buddhists from which as from the sacred writings of the Jainas, it is distinguished, greatly to its advantage by its comparative simplicity and brevity. Cf. also S. Beal's very pertinent observations in the *Ind. Antiq.* iv. 90.

* The most authentic information as yet is to be found in the Introduction to G. Turnour's edition of the Mahavansa (1835 Ceylon) and in the scattered essays of this scholar also though only in very general outline, in Westergaard's Catalogue of the Copenhagen Indian MS., (1846, Havnas) which comprise a tolerable number of the Pāli works purchased by the celebrated Raja in Ceylon. Clough's writings too contain much that bears up on this subject also. Spiegel's *Anecdota Palica*. Exceedingly copious information regarding Southern Buddhism is contained in a work that has just reached me by R. Spence

Hardy, *Eastern Monachism, an Account of the Origin, Laws, &c., of the Order of Mendicants founded by Gotama Buddha* London, 1850, 444 pp. The author was twenty years a Wesleyan missionary in Ceylon and appears to have employed this time to excellent purpose. [This was followed in 1853 by his *Manual of Buddhism*, also a very valuable work.—The study of Pāli and its literature has recently taken a great spring particularly through the labours of V. Fausboll (*Dhammapadam*, 1855; *Pit. Jatakas* 1861; *Dhammapadam* 1871, 1872; *Jatakas together with its commentary* 1875); James de Alwis (*Introduction to Kachchayana's Grammar* 1863; *Attanagaluwan's* 1866); F. Grunblet (*Extraits du Paritta* 1870); J. Feer (*Dhammasutta* and others of these Pāli suttas in his *Textes tires du Kandjour* 1869 ff.); Job Mayeff (*Pātimokkhasutta and Vuttadisa*, 1869; *Grammaire Pāli* 1874; Paris edition 1872); L. Kuhn (*Kachchayana's Grammar*, 1869; 1871; *Beitrage zur Pāli Grammatik* 1875); E. Senart (*Grammaire de Kachchayana*, 1871); R. Childers (*Khuddakapatha* 1869; *Dictionary of the Pāli Language* 1872-74); M. Comara Srinani (*Suttanipata* 1874) to which may be added the grammatical writings of W. Stoeck (1858; 1862) and Fr. Müller (1867-69).

³⁴⁶ Northern Buddhism has likewise found its historians. The Tibetan Tārānātha (see note 35) cites as his precursors Bhatighata, Indradatta, Khehemendrabhadra,

With respect now to the scriptures of the Northern Buddhists, the Sanskrit originals namely—for it is these alone that concern us here—we must, in the first place, keep in view that, even according to the tradition, their existing text belongs only to the first century of our era, so that, even although there should be works among them dating from the two earlier councils, yet these were in any case subjected to revision at the third. In the next place, it is *a priori* improbable—not is it indeed directly alleged—that the whole of the existing works owed their origin to this third council, and amongst them there must certainly be many belonging to a later period. And lastly, we must not even assume that all the works translated in the Tibetan Kāgyur were already in existence at the time when translations into Tibetan began to be made (in the seventh century), for the Kāgyur was not completed all at once, but was only definitively fixed after a prolonged and gradual growth*. From these considerations alone, it is abundantly plain how cautious we ought to be in making use of these works. But there is still more to be borne in mind. For even supposing the origin of the most ancient of them really to date from the first and second councils,³⁴⁷ still, to assume that they were recorded in writing so early as this is not only *prima facie* questionable, but is, besides, distinctly opposed to analogy, since we are expressly informed that, with the Southern Buddhists, the consignment to writing only took place in the year B.C. 80, long subsequent to both councils. The main purpose of the third council under Kanishka may possibly just have been to draw up written records, had such records been already in existence, Buddhism could hardly have been split up thus early into eighteen different sects, as we are told was the case in Kanishka's time, only 400 years after Buddha's death. Why, during all the eighteen centuries that have since elapsed no such amount of schism has sprung up, evidently because a written basis was then secured. Lastly, one important point which must not be

* According to Csoma Koro 1, the Tibetan translations date from the seventh to the thirteenth centuries, principally from the ninth.

³⁴⁷ The data contained in the

Bhabra misssive as to the *dhamma palidyaṇi* as they then stood render such a supposition extremely doubtful here just as in the case of the Pāli Tipiṭaka (see note 343)

lost sight of in estimating the authenticity of the existing Buddhist scriptures is the circumstance that the sources from which they were drawn were in a different language. True, we cannot make out with absolute certainty in what language Buddha taught and preached, but as it was to the people he addressed himself, it is in the highest degree probable that he spoke in the vernacular idiom. Again, it was in Magadhi* that the first council of his disciples assembled, and it was doubtless conducted in the dialect of this country, which indeed passes as the sacred language of Buddhism. The same remark applies to the second council, as well as to the one which, according to the Southern Buddhists, is the third, both of which were likewise held in Magadhi†. Mahendra, who converted Ceylon in the year following this third council, took with him to that island the Magadhi language, afterwards called Pali‡. This, too, is the dialect in which the inscriptions of this period, which at least bespeak Buddhist influence, are composed³⁴⁵. At the last council, on the contrary, which falls some 300 years later, and at which the existing scriptures of the Northern Buddhists are alleged to have

* In the old capital (Rājagṛha).

† In the new capital (Pāṭaliputra).

‡ That Pali could have been developed in Ceylon from an imported Sanskrit is altogether inconceivable.

³⁴⁵ The edicts of Piyadasi present themselves to us in three distinct dialects. One of these, that of Dhauḥ, exhibits a number of the peculiarities which distinctively belong to the Ardhamāgadhī of the Janas and the dialect designated Magadhī by the Prākṛit grammarians. It is in this that the Bhāṣya mis- sive addressed to the third council is composed—a circumstance which conclusively proves that it was then the official language of Buddhism, and, in point of fact, Māgadhī (since Dhauḥ belongs geographically to this district) see *I & II* in 180 and my Essay on the Bhagavatī of the Janas, p. 396. Put then on the other hand this dialect displays a particularly marked divergence from Pali, the language which has come

down to us officially under the name of Māgadhī, and which presents special features of resemblance to that dialect rather which is employed in the inscriptions of Guntur. The question has therefore been raised whether Pali is really entitled to the name Māgadhī, which in the Pāli literature is applied to it, or whether it may not have received this title merely from motives of ecclesiastical policy, having reference to the significance of the land of Magadha in the history of Buddhism. Westergaard even surmises (*Ueber den ältesten Zeitraum der indischen Geschichte* p. 87 n., 1862) that Pali is identical with the dialect of Ujjayini, the mother tongue of Mahendra, who was born there and Ernst Kuhn (*Beitrag zur Pāli Grammatik* p. 7, 1875) adopts this opinion. Put Pischel (*Jenaische Zeit.* 1875 p. 316) and Chailers (*Pāli Dict.* Preface p. vii.) pronounce against it.

been compiled, the language employed for this purpose was not Magadhi, but Sanskrit, although not the purest. The reason of this lies simply in the locality. For this concluding council was not held in Magadha, nor even in Hindustan at all, whose rulers were not then favourably disposed towards Buddhism, but in Kāshnār, a district which—partly no doubt in consequence of its being peopled exclusively by Aryan tribes,* but partly also (see pp 26, 45, 178) because, like the North-West of India generally, it has to be regarded as a chief seat of the cultivation of Indian grammar—had preserved its language purer than those Aryans had been able to do who had emigrated to India, and there mingled with the native inhabitants. Those priests,† therefore, who here undertook the compilation and recording in writing of the sacred scriptures were, if not accomplished grammarians, yet in all probability sufficiently conversant with grammar to be able to write passable Sanskrit‡

Agreeably to what has just been set forth,³⁴⁹ it is in the highest degree risky to regard, as has hitherto been done,

* The Greeks and Scythians were both too scanty in numbers, and too short a time in close contact with the natives, to exercise any influence in the way of modifying the language.

† And it was evidently priests, educated men therefore, who formed the third council. In the first two, laymen may have taken part, but the Buddhistic hierarchy had had time to develop sufficiently in the interval.

‡ Burnouf thinks differently, *Hist du Buddh.*, pp 105, 106, as also Lassen, *I. Aik.*, II. 9 491-493 [but see *I. St.*, III. 139, 179 ff.]

³⁵⁰ Beside the two branches of Buddhistic literature discussed in the foregoing pages—the Pāli texts of the Southern and the Sāṅkyi texts of the Northern Buddhists—there stands a third group, occupying from its original constitution, a kind of intermediate place between the other two—namely, the Ārḍhamāgadhī texts of the Jains. The sect of the Jains is in all probability

to be regarded as one of the schismatic sects that branched off from Buddhism in the first centuries of its existence. The legendary narratives of the personal activity of its founder Mahāvira, not only refer it exclusively to the same district which Buddhism also recognises as its holy land, but they, moreover, display so close an affinity to the accounts of Buddha's ministry that we cannot but recognise in the two groups of narratives merely varying forms of common reminiscences. Another indication that the Jaina sect arose in this way out of Buddhism—although by some it has even been regarded as of pre-Buddhistic origin—is afforded by the circumstance, amongst others, that its sacred texts are styled, not *Sūtras*, but *Āṅgas* and consequently, in contradistinction to the oldest Buddhist texts which date from the Vedic *Sūtra* period, belong rather to the *Āṅga* stage, that is to say, to the period when the *Āṅgas* or *Vedāṅgas* were posterior to the Vedic *Sūtras*.

the data yielded by a Buddhistic literature fashioned in this way as valid for the epoch of Buddha himself, which is removed from the last council by an interval of four, or, if we accept the Southern chronology, of nearly six, centuries. Oral traditions, committed to writing in a different language, after such a series of years, and more over only extant in a mass of writings that lie several centuries apart, and of which the oldest portions have still to be critically sifted out, can only be used with extreme caution, and *a priori* the data they furnish serve, not so much to characterise the epoch about which they tell as rather the epoch, in particular, in which they received their present shape. But however doubtful, according to

were produced. But there is a further circumstance which is quite conclusive as to this point—namely that the language in which these texts are composed and which, according to the scholars, is Ardha-māgadhī, exhibits a more developed and considerably later phase than the language of the Pāli texts, to which, in its turn, the Pāli scholars expressly apply the designation Māgadhī. (At the same time there are also dialectic differences between the two.) See my paper on the Bhagavati of the Jāinas, pp. 441, 373, 396 ff., 416. To the eleven principal Āṅgas have to be added a large number of other writings styled *Upāṅga*, *Mūla Sūtra*, *Kalpa Sūtra*, &c. An enumeration of the entire set, showing a total of fifty works consisting of about 600,000 slokas may be seen in Rājendra Lal Mitra's *Notices of Sanskrit MSS.*, iii. 67 ff., 1874. Of these texts—our knowledge of the Jāinas is otherwise derived from Brāhmanic sources only—all that has hitherto been published is a fragment of the fifth Āṅga or Bhagavati Sūtra, dating perhaps from the first centuries of our era, edited by myself (1866-67). In *I S.*, x. 254 ff. (1867), I have also given an account of the *Sūrya-pragapti*, or seventh Upāṅga Sūtra a commentary on

which is said to have been composed by Bhadrabāhusvāmin author of the Kalpa-Sūtra, a work seemingly written in the seventh century. Lastly, there is a translation by Stevenson (1843) of this Kalpa Sūtra itself, which stands thirtieth in the list of the sacred texts. Cf. also S. J. Warren *Über die godadienstige en weygeerde Begrippen der Jāinas* 1875. Thanks to G. Bühler's friendly exertions the Royal Library in Berlin has lately acquired possession of nearly all these fifty sacred texts, with or without commentaries, and in good old MSS., so that we may hope soon to be better informed regarding them. But the Jāinas have also a great significance in connection with Sanskrit literature, more especially for grammar and lexicography, as well as on account of the historical and literary matter which they have preserved (see above, p. 214. and of my paper on the Śatrumāya Māhātmya 1858). One of their most honoured names is that of Hemachandra who flourished in the time of the Gurjara prince Kumārāditya (1028-1172). Under the title *Yoga Śāstra* he composed a compendium of the Jāina doctrines in twelve *pralambas*, the first four of which, treating of their ethics have recently been edited and translated by Ernst Windisch (*Z D M G* xxviii, 18, ff., 1874).

this view, are the validity and authority of these writings in reference to the subjects which they have hitherto been taken to illustrate, they are nevertheless important, on the other hand, for the history of the inner development of Buddhism itself, though even here, of course, their trustworthiness is altogether relative. For the many marvelous stories they recount both of Buddha himself and of his disciples and other adherents, as well as the extravagant mythology gradually developed in them, produce upon the whole the impression of a wild and formless chaos of fantastic inventions.

Our chief object must now, of course, be to establish a relative chronology and order of sequence amongst these various writings—a task which Burnouf, whose researches are our sole authority on the subject,* also set himself, and which he has executed with great judgment and tolerable conclusiveness. And, first, of the *Sūtras*, or accounts of Buddha himself. Burnouf divides these into two classes: the *simple Sūtras*, and the so-called *Mahāvaiṣṭya-* or *Mahāyāna-Sūtras*, which he declares to be the more modern of the two in point of language, form, and doctrine. As far as the latter point is concerned, he is no doubt right. For, in the first place, in the *Mahāvaiṣṭya-Sūtras* Buddha appears almost exclusively surrounded by gods and Bodhisattvas (beings peculiar to the Buddhist mythology), whereas in the *simple Sūtras* it is human beings who mostly form his following, with whom gods are only now and then associated. And, in the second place, the *simple Sūtras* do not exhibit any trace of those doctrines which are not common Buddhist property, but belong to the Northern Buddhists only as, for example the worship of Amitabha, Mañjuśrī, Avalokiteśvara, Adibuddha † and the Dhyanibuddhas, and further, do not contain any trace of mystic spells and magic formulas, all of which are found, and in abundance, in the

* I cannot refrain from expressing here, in a few words at least, my sincere and profound sorrow that now, as the sheets, which I would so gladly have submitted to his judgment are passing through the press, Eu due Burnouf has been taken from among us. His prepa-

ture death is an irreparable loss to learning, as well as to all who knew him, and which is the same thing revered and loved him.

† The word is found in a total of different senses in those portions of the *Māndūkyaopaniṣad* which are due to Gauḍapāda.

Mahāvaiṣṭya-Sūtras only. But whether the circumstance that the language of the lengthy poetical pieces which are inserted with special frequency in these last, appears in a much more degenerated form—to wit, a medley of Sanskrit, Prakrit, and Pali—than is the case with the prose portions is to be taken as a proof of the posteriority of the Mahāvaiṣṭya-Sūtras, does not seem to be quite so certain as yet. Do these poetical portions, then, really agree so completely in form and substance, with the prose text in respect to the several points just instanced that they may be regarded as merely an amplification or recapitulation of it? Or are they not rather distinguished from it precisely, in these points, so that we might regard them as fragments of older traditions handed down in verse, exactly like the analogous pieces which occur so often in the Brahmanas? * In the latter case we should have to regard them as proof, rather that the Buddhist legends, &c., were not originally composed in Sanskrit but in vernacular dialects. From the account of the

* We must be content with simply putting the question, as we are still unfortunately without the Sanskrit text of even a single one of these Sūtras, the sole exception being an insignificant fragment from the *Lalitavistara* one of the Mahāvaiṣṭya Sūtras, communicated by Foucaux at the end of his edition of the Tibetan translation of this work. [The entire text of the *Lalitavistara*, in twenty-seven chapters, has since appeared in the *Bibl. Ind.*, edited by Rājendra Lal Mitra (1853 ff.), the translation breaks off at chapter iii. Foucaux published the fourth chapter of the *Saddharma-puṇḍarīka* in 1852 and Leon Feer an Avadana, named *Pratidvaya*, in 1867. Lastly, the *Kāraṇa-śruti* a terribly inflated Mahāvaiṣṭya Sūtra, in honour of Avalokiteśvara has been edited by Satyavratas Śāstrin (Calcutta, 1873). A translation of the *Lalitavistara* begun by S. Leumann in 1874, embraces so far the first five chapters, and is accompanied with

very copious notes.—The conjecture expressed above as to the poetical portions had previously been advanced—although when I wrote I was not aware of the fact—in the *Journ. As. Soc. Beng.*, 18, 1 p. 283, see *I. Et.*, iii. 140. It was subsequently worked out in greater detail by Rājendra Lal Mitra, in a special essay on the dialect of these Gāthās, likewise in *Journ. As. Soc. Beng.* (1854, No. 6). Here the date of their composition is even carried back to the period immediately preceding Buddha's death, see Muir, *Orig. S. Texts*, i. 2 115 ff. Kern *Über die Jāgaddh* 79 p. 105 ff., does not see in these Gāthās any poetical dialect, but merely later versions of stanzas originally composed in pure Prakrit. Lastly, Edward Müller, in his tract, *Der Dialekt der Gāthā des Lalitavistara* (Weimar 1874) perceives in them the work of poets who were not quite at home in Sanskrit and who endeavored to fit the laxness of their own vernacular

Chinese traveller, Fa Hien, who made a pilgrimage from China to India and back in A.D. 399-414, it would appear that the Mahāvaiṣṭya-Sūtras were then already pretty widely diffused, since he mentions several of the doctrines peculiar to them as extensively studied.³⁰

Of the *simple* Sūtras, it is at least possible, in the absence of evidence, that such as are concerned solely with Buddha's personality may be more ancient than those relating also to persons who lived some hundreds of years later, but beyond this we cannot at present determine anything. Their contents are of a somewhat multifarious description, and for the several divisions we also find special technical designations*. They contain either simple legends, styled *Itivutta* and *Vyākaraṇa* (corresponding to

³⁰ The accounts of Fa Hien are far surpassed in moment by those of Hsuan Tsang, who travelled over India in the years 629-645 A.D. Of special importance also are the Chinese translations of Buddhist works, which are nearly all based upon the texts of the Northern Buddhists and some of which profess to be very ancient. Of four such translations of the *Lalitavistara*, the first is said to have been made at a date so early as A.D. 70-76 the second in A.D. 308 and the third in 652, see on this I. V., in 140 viii 326. Similarly, the *Saddharma-puṇḍarīka* is said to have been thrice translated first in A.D. 280, next in A.D. 397-402, and again in A.D. 601-605. Beal, in the *Indian Antiquary*, iv 90, 91, mentions not only a translation of the *Brahmajāla Sūtra* of the year A.D. 420 but also a whole set of fifty Sūtras (among them e.g., the *Sāmaśāla*) translated at different dates from

A.D. 70 to 600 and by various scholars, all of them from Sanskrit or Pāli. — All, therefore, from the Indian original, — whereas the translations of later times were mostly derived through the medium of the Tibetan. For the criticism of the respective texts, fuller particulars of these, so pure so ancient, transla-

tions would of course be of great importance. Of one of these works, a version of the *Abhisamayavajrasūtra*, a complete translation has recently been published by E. J., under the title *The Romantic Legend of Śaṅkya Buddha*, 1875. The special points of relation here found to Christian legends are very striking. The question which party was the borrower Beal properly leaves undetermined, yet in all likelihood we have here simply a similar case to that of the appropriation of Christian legends by the worshippers of Kyōshin — Highly important for the history of Northern Buddhism is W. W. de Silva's work, drawn from Tibetan Chinese sources, *Der Buddhismus*, 1860 as also Taranātha's *History of Buddhism in India*, a work composed so late as 1608, but resting upon older, and in part Sanskrit, authorities rendered into Russian by Wassiljew, — Tibetan text, with German version, by Schiefner, 1869 cf. also Lassen *I. AK*, ii 6, note.

* According to Spiegel in his review of which I have frequently availed myself here, of Burnouf's work, in the *Jahrbuch für Wiss. Asien*, 1845, p. 547, most of these names are also found among the Southern Buddhists.

the Itihāsa-Purāṇas in the Brāhmanas), or legends in the form of parables, styled *Avadāna*, in which we find many elements of the later animal-fables,⁵⁵¹ or further, tales of presages and wonders, *Adbhuta-dharma*, or again, single stanzas or songs of several stanzas (*Geya* and *Gāthā*) serving to corroborate previous statements, or lastly, special instruction in, and discussion of, definite topics, denominated *Upadeśa* and *Ādāna*. All these reappear in a similar way, only in a much more antique guise and under different names,* in the Brahmanas and Aranyakas, as well as in the prose legends interspersed here and there throughout the Mahā-Bharata, which in style also (though not in language) offer the greatest resemblance to these Buddhist Sūtras. Quite peculiar to these latter,† however, are the passages called *Jātaka*, which treat of the prior births of Buddha and the Bodhi-attvas.

Now those data in the Sūtras which have hitherto been taken as valid for Buddha's time, but which we can only consider as valid, primarily, for the time when the Sūtras were composed, are chiefly of a kind bearing upon the history of the Indian religion. For just as Buddha recognised the existence of caste, so, too, he naturally recognised the then existing Hindū Pantheon‡. But it must not by any means be imagined that in Buddha's time this Pantheon had attained to that phase of development which we here find in the Sūtras, assuming that we follow the

⁵⁵¹ From the Chinese translation Stan Julien has published quite a collection of such stories, for the most part very short (*Le Avadanas Contes et Apologues Indiens* 1859). The high importance of the e, as well as of the Buddhist Jātaka and other stories generally, in the literature of the fable and fairy tale, is shown in full relief by Benfey in the introduction to his translation of the Padhastantra.

* Only Gāthā and Upadeśa (Adesa at least) occur also in the Brāhmanas.

† Although connecting links are found here and there in the Mahā-Bharata also especially in the twelfth book. Indeed, many of the Buddhist

legends stand distinctly related to corresponding Brahmanic popular tales and legends, which they have simply transformed (or conversely, into which they have themselves been transformed) to suit the object in view.

‡ Lassen's assertion (*I A S* II 453) that 'Buddha recognised no gods refers only to the circumstance that they too are regarded by him as subjected to the eternal succession of existence, their existence itself he in no way denied, for in the doctrines put into his mouth there is constant reference to them [He abolished their significance however, as he did that of caste]

Southern chronology and place Buddha in the sixth century B.C., that is, doubtless, in the period of the Brahmanas—works in which a totally different Pantheon prevails. But if, on the other hand, he did not teach until the fourth century B.C., as must be the case if the assertion of the Tibetans and Chinese be correct, to the effect that the third council took place under Kanishka (who lived A.D. 40), four hundred years after Buddha's death—and this view is favoured by the circumstance that of the names of teachers who are mentioned as contemporaries of Buddha such as appear in the Brahmanical writings all belong to the literature of the Vedic Sūtras, not to that of the Brahmanas—there would at least be a greater possibility, *a priori*, that the Pantheon found in the Buddhist Sūtras, together with similar data, might have some validity for the time of Buddha, which on this supposition would be much nearer to them. The details of the subject are briefly these. The Yakshas, Garudas, Kinnaras,^{2,2} so often mentioned in these Sūtras, are still quite unknown in the Brahmanas. The name Dānava, too, occurs but seldom (once as an epithet of Vritra, a second time as an epithet of Sushna), and never in the plural to designate the Asuras generally,²³ nor are the gods ever styled Suras there.²⁴ The names of the Nagas and Mahanagas are never mentioned,* although serpent-worship itself (*sarpa-widyā*) is repeatedly referred to,† the Kumbhan-

² Where the Kinnaras and their wives appear as 'heavenly choristers,' as, e.g., in the Meghaduta Raghuvans and Mahā Bhārata, I consider the word to be a popular 'ymological adaptation from the Greek *κινῶν*, although the latter is properly only used of mournful, plaintive tones. *Kinnara* itself is formed after the model of *kin-purusha*.

²³ This is a mistake. The Dānas, Dānavas, appear even in the Rik; nay, the former in the Avesta as well, see *Alta Yekt*, § 73, *Farvard Y.* § 37, 38 (here as earthly foes?).

²⁴ *Sura* is a bastard formation from *asura* resting on a misreading of the word, which was wrongly analysed into a *sura*. The

mention of the term in Nir., iii. 3, is patently an interpolation, as it is quite foreign to the Vedic texts.

* "In the sense of elephant the word *naga* occurs in the Yajñik Aranyaka, Mādhy. i. 1. 24' (Erata, first German ed.) [Also in the Ait. Br., viii. 22, whereas in the Sat. Br., xi. 2. 7. 12 *mahanaga* is better interpreted, with Sāyana, as 'serpent'. The antiquity of this latter meaning is favoured by etymology of Engl. *snake*, see *Kuhn's Zeitschrift*, ix. 233-234.]

† In the Atharva Sāmhitā, in particular, many prayers are addressed to the *Sarpas*, in the Sat. Br. they are once identified with the *lohas*. Can the term have originally denoted 'the stars' and other spirits?

das too, are absent. This lack of allusion in the Brahmanas to any of these *genui* might be explained by supposing them to have been principally the divinities of the inferior classes of the people, to which classes Buddha specially addressed himself, and to whose conceptions and range of ideas he was therefore obliged to have particular regard. In this there may be a great deal of truth, but the remaining cycle of deities, also, which appears in the Buddhistic Sūtras, is completely that belonging to the epic poetry. In the Brahmanas, on the contrary, the name of Kuvera, for instance is only mentioned once† (and that in the Brahman of the White Yajus),²⁵ Śiva and Saṃkara only occur along with other appellative epithets of Rudra, and are never employed alone as proper names to denote him, the name of Narayana again, is of extremely rare occurrence, whilst Sakia,²⁶ Vasava,²⁷ Hari, Upendra, Janardana, Pītamāha, are totally unknown. We thus perceive that the Buddhistic Sūtras, in all of which these names are prevalent represent precisely the same stage as the Epic literature‡. The

of the air! [Serpent-worship has unquestionably mythological, symbolical relations, but, on the other hand, it has also a thoroughly realistic background.] The Maitrayani Upanishad does, indeed, mention the Saras, Yakshas, and Uragas, but this Upanishad belongs (see p. 98) altogether to the later period. It is allied to the Buddhistic Sūtras in contents, and probably also in age.

* A kind of dwarf with 'testicles as large as jars' (!) In the later Brahmanical writings they are styled *Kushmandras* *Kushmandas* ('gourd' !), see also Mahābhārata on Vy. Smṛti, xx. 14. [Cf. the *Kuśmaṇḍas* in Ath. viii. 6. 15, xi. 9. 17, and perhaps also the same deities in Rik. vii. 21. 5 x 90. 3, both on Nir. p. 47.]

† The Taittiriya Aranyaka, which contains several of these names, can not exactly be ranked with the Brāhmaṇa literature.

²⁵ Also in the parallel passages in the Rik Sūtra, and once besides in the Ath. S. (viii. 10. 28).

²⁶ As an appellative epithet of

Indra Śakra occurs in the Rik even, but it is there employed of other gods as well.

²⁷ As an epithet of Indra (but not as a name for him) Vā. vi. 2 occurs once in Ath. S. vi. 82. 1. In the Nirukti also xii. 41, it appears in direct connection with him, but at the same time also with Agni, indeed it is with Agni and not with Indra that the Vasus are chiefly associated in the Brāhmaṇas, see I. St. v. 2. 0, 24.

‡ The Māra so frequently mentioned would almost appear to be a purely Buddhistic invention, in Brahmanical writings I have nowhere met with him. [Minayeff's conjecture in the introduction to his *Grammaire de l'Inde* trad. par Stan. Guyard p. viii., that the name Māra is directly related to *Mārga*, an epithet of Ahuraṃ in the Avesta, and in such a way that both 'remontent à une époque antérieure à la séparation des Iraniens et des Hindous' is rendered extremely doubtful by the mere circumstance that nothing of the sort occurs anywhere in the Veda.

non-mention of Krishna³³ proves nothing to the contrary, the worship of Krishna as a divinity being of altogether uncertain date³⁴ besides, it is still a question whether we have not really to understand him by the Asura Krishna who is repeatedly referred to in these Sūtras (see p. 148) —Although—to notice other points besides the Pantheon—the lunar asterisms in the Sūtras begin with *Kṛttikā*, that is to say, still retain their old order, we cannot adduce this as proof that a comparatively high antiquity ought to be assigned to these writings, for the new order of the asterisms probably only dates from the fourth or fifth century A.D., all that results from this is, that the particular passages are earlier than this last-mentioned date. As an indication, on the contrary, of a date not specially ancient, we must certainly regard the mention of the planets, as also the occurrence of the word *dīnara* (from *denarius*), which Burnouf (p. 424, n.) has twice met with in the *old* Sūtras (see Lassen, *I AK*, II. 348).

As regards the second division of the Buddhist scriptures, the *Vinaya-Pitaka* or precepts concerning discipline and worship, these are almost entirely wanting in the Paris collection, doubtless because they are looked upon as peculiarly holy, and are therefore kept as secret as possible by the priests, being indeed specially intended for

(Gopātha Br., I. 28 see note 166, is only an apparent exception, due probably to Buddhist influence) If, therefore, a direct connection really exists between Māra and Anra Maṇava it can only have come about in historic times, and for this there is nowhere any analogy.

³³ Whether the Southern Buddhists are acquainted with Krishna is not yet clear. Buddha's prior birth as Kṛṣṇa has, according to the text published in Faubell's edition, p. 194, nothing to do with Krishna. The *Jātaka* as *Mahākṛṣṇa* (No. 461 in Westergaard's *Catal.*, p. 41) can hardly have any reference to him either, but what of the *Jātaka* as *Kṛṣṇa* (No. 341 in Westergaard's *Catal.*, p. 40)? The expression in Hardy, *East Mon.*, p. 41, "You are yet a youth, your hair is like

that of Krishna" (*I St.*, III. 161), is unfortunately not before us in the original text: might not the passage simply mean, "Your hair is yet black?" The fact of Krishna appearing in the *Abhidhānapaddī* *pikā* as a name of Viṣṇu proves, of course, just as little for the ancient texts as the patronymics Kṛṣṇa, Kṛṣṇāyana in the school on Kaśchā, v. 2. 4 (Senart, pp. 185-186), which have necessarily to be referred to the epic or divine personality of Krishna.

³⁴ On the significance of the date contained in the *Mahābhāṣya* on this point, see *I St.*, XII. 349 for the earliest occurrence of Krishna in an inscription, see Bayley in *Journ. As. Soc. Beng.* 1854, p. 51 ff., with which cf. *I St.*, II. 81, and my *Essai Über Krishna's Geburtsort* p. 318.

the clergy—Like the Buddhist mythology the Buddhist hierarchy was a thing of gradual growth. Buddha, as we have seen, received all without distinction as disciples, and when ere long, in consequence of the great numbers, and of the practice of living constantly together, except in the winter season, some kind of distribution of rank was required, it was upon the principle of age* or merit† that this took place. As the Buddhist faith spread more and more, it became necessary to distinguish between those who devoted themselves entirely to the priestly calling, the *bhikkhus*‡ monks, and *bhikkhunis*, nuns, on the one

* The aged were called *sthavira*, a word not unfrequently added to a proper name in the Brahmanical Sūtras to distinguish a particular person from younger namesakes. Points of connection herewith are to be found in the Brāhmanas also. [Regarding the winter season see Chisholm's *Pāli Dict.*, s. v. *vetasa*.]

† The venerable were styled *arhant* (अरहन्), also a title bestowed upon teachers in the Brāhmanas.

‡ When Pāṇini speaks of Bhikkhu Sūtras, and gives as their authors Pāṇḍiāya and Karmāda, teaching (iv 3 110, 111) that their respective adherents are to be styled Pāṇḍiārinās and Karmādinās, and (iv 2 80) that the Sūtra of the former is called Pāṇḍiāriya, the allusion must be to Brahmanical mendicants, since these names are not mentioned in Buddhist writings. By Wilson too, in the second edition of his Dictionary, *karmādin* is given as 'beggar, religious mendicant, member of the fourth order' [According to the St. Petersburg Dictionary, from Amara, ii 7 41, and Hemachandra, 809.] But the circumstance must not be overlooked that, according to the Calcutta scholastic neither of these two rules of Pāṇini is explained in the Mahābhāṣya, and that possibly therefore, they may not be Pāṇini's at all, but posterior to the time of Pātanjali. [The Pāṇḍiārinā bhikkhavaḥ at least, are really mentioned in the Bhāṣya to iv 2 66 see I St., xiii 340.]—That mendicant

monks must, as a matter of fact, have been particularly numerous in Pāṇini's time is apparent from the many rules he gives for the formation of words in a connection e.g., *bhikkhichāra*, ii 2 17, *bhikkhāda*, iii 2 155, *bhikkhā*, iii 2 108. *bhikkhā* from *bhikkh* in the sense of *bhikkhichāra* *śamāsa*, iv 2 33 Compare, in connection also ii 1 70, where the formation of the name for female mendicants (*brāhmanā*, and, in the game, *pravrajitā*) is treated of, which can only refer to Buddhist female mendicants. [This last rule, which gives the epithet 'virgin' as a special (not as an indispensable) quality of the *brāhmanā* taken in connection with iv 1 127, can hardly be said to throw a very favourable light on the 'virginity' of the class generally, cf. Manu, viii 363 note 330 above. The word *śravastāna*, v 2 9, and *kaṇṭhika*, iv 4 6, likewise exhibit a very distinct Buddhist colouring, on this see I St., v 140 ff. On Buddhist mendicants at the time of the Bhāṣya, see the data collected in I St. xiii 340 ff.]—The entire institution of the fourth order rests essentially on the Sāṅkhya doctrine and its extension was certainly due to a large extent to Buddhism. The red or reddish yellow garment (*kaṣṭhīyavāsana*) and the tonsure (*śikhaśūnya*) are the principal badges of the Buddhist *bhikkhus* see above, pp 78, 237. On a commentary extant in India, on a Bakshī Sūtra, see I St., i 470.

band, and the Buddhist laity on the other, *upāsakas* and *upāsikās** Within the priesthood itself, again, numerous shades of distinction in course of time grew up, until at length the existing hierarchy arose, a hierarchy which differs very essentially from the Brahmanical one, inasmuch as admission to the priestly order is still, as in Buddha's time, allowed to members of the lowest castes on the same conditions as to any one else. Among the laity the Indian castes still continue to exist wherever they existed in the past, it is only the Brahman caste, or priesthood by birth, that has been abolished, and in its place a clergy by choice of vocation substituted. The Buddhist cult, too, which now is second to none in the world for solemnity, dignity, pomp, and specialities was originally exceedingly simple, consisting mainly in the adoration of the image of Buddha and of his relics. Of the latter point we are first informed by Clemens Alexandrinus. Afterwards the same honour was paid to the relics of his most eminent disciples also, and likewise to princes who had deserved specially well of Buddhism. The story of the ashes of Menander, related by Plutarch (see Wilson, *Ariana*, p 283), is doubtless to be understood in this sense†. Now this relic-worship, the building of steeples—traceable, perhaps, to the topes (*stūpas*) which

* Or specially *buddhopāsaka*, *buddhopāsikā*, as we find it several times in the *Mṛcchhakatī*.

† For I regard Menander, who on his coins is called Minanda, as identical with Milinda, king of Sāṅgala (Sāṅgala), respecting whom see Turmour in the *Journ. As Soc. Beng.*, v 530 ff., Burneuf, *l. c.*, p 621, and *Catal. MSS. Or. Bibl. Haun.*, p 50. (From an article by Spiegel in the *Kieler Allgemeine Monatschrift*, July 1852, p 561, which has just reached me while correcting these sheets, I see that Benfey has already identified Menander with Milinda [see the *Berlin Jahrbücher für wis. Kritik*, 1842 p 87*])—Schiefner in his notice, *Ueber Indra's Donnerkeil*, p 4 of the separate impression, 1848, has expressed the conjecture that the Buddha Amitā-

bha, who is uniformly placed in the western country Sukhavatī, may be identical with Amyntas, whose name appears as Amita on his coins, in the name Basil, too (in Schmidt's *Dianglun* p 331), he discovers the word βασιλευς [But Schiefner calls my attention to the circumstance, that as far back as 1852 in his *Ergänzungen und Berichtigungen zu Schmidt's Ausgabe des Dianglun* p 56 to p 256, 13 of the Tibetan text he withdrew the identification of Basil with βασιλευς his connection, too, of Amita with Amyntas, which had been questioned by Köppen, is 28, note 4, he now regards as doubtful.] The legend of the Western origin of the Śākyas I have already characterised (p 285) as perhaps invented as a compliment to Kanishka.

owe their origin to this relic-worship—the system of monachism, the use of bells and rosaries,* and many other details, offer such numerous features of resemblance to Christian ritual, that the question whether Christianity may not perhaps have been here the borrowing party is by no means to be summarily negatived, particularly as it is known that Buddhist missionaries penetrated at an early period, possibly even in the two centuries preceding our era, into Western countries as far as Asia Minor. This is still, however, an entirely open question, and requires investigation.³⁰⁰

The third division of the Buddhist sacred scriptures, the *Abhidharma-Piṭaka*, contains philosophical, and especially metaphysical, discussions. It is hardly to be imagined that Buddha himself was not clearly cognizant of the philosophical basis of his teaching, and that he simply adopted this latter from his predecessors, so that the courage and energy pertaining to its public promulgation constituted his sole merit. But it seems just as certain that he was not concerned to propagate a philosophical system, and that his aim was purely a practical one, to

* Afterwards adopted by the Brahmins also. [The very name *rosary* has possibly arisen from a confusion of the two Indian words *japa-mālā* and *japa-mālā*, see my paper, *Ueber Krishna's Geburtstest*, pp. 340, 341, Köppen, *Die Religion des Buddha*, II 319, and also my letter in the *Indian Antiquary* IV 250.]

³⁰⁰ See *Ind. Skiz.* p. 64 (1857), and the data from the Abbé Hue's *Travels in Tibet* in Köppen, I. 561, II 116. According to the interesting discovery made by Laboulaye (see Müller, *Chips*, IV 185) and F. Labrecht with regard to Barlaam and Josaphat, one of the saints of the Catholic Church stands at length revealed as Bodhisattva himself—a discovery to which Re naud a ingenious identification of Yūdāś, Yūdāś with Būdāś (Mém. sur l'Inde, p. 91) might alone have led, see *Z. D. M. G.*, XXIV 480.—But neither is the contrary supposition, namely, that Christian influences may have af-

fected the growth of Buddhist ritual and worship, as they did that of the Buddhist legends, by any means to be dismissed out of hand. Indeed, quite apart from the oft-ventilated question as to the significance of such influences in the further development of Krishna worship, there are legends connected with the Siva cult also, as to which it is not at all a far-fetched hypothesis that they have reference to scattered Christian missionaries: see *J. St.* I. 421, II 398, *Z. D. M. G.*, XXVII 166 (V 263).—That Western influence has played a part in Tibet finds support in a letter of Schiefner's, according to which, in a work of Dmaja Pandita, Galen is mentioned as the physician of the Persians, and is said to have been consulted by the first Tibetan king, along with a celebrated Indian and a celebrated Chinese physician.

† In this conrage the circumstance that he belonged by birth to the military caste finds expression.

awaken virtuous actions and dispositions. This is in accord with the circumstance, that whereas the Buddhists allege of the Sūtra-Pitaka and the Vinaya-Pitaka that they were delivered by Buddha himself, in the case of the Abhidharma-Pitaka, on the contrary, they start with the admission that it is the production of his disciples. According to Burnouf, the doctrines of the Abhidharma are in reality only a further development or continuation of the views here and there propounded in the Sūtras, indeed, the writings in question often merely add single words to the thoughts expressed in the Sūtras "but in any case there exists an interval of several centuries between the two, and that difference which distinguishes a doctrine still in its earliest beginnings from a philosophy which has arrived at its furthest development."* In the Brahma-Sūtra of Bādarāyana doctrines are repeatedly combated which, on Śāṅkara's testimony, belong to two distinct schools of Buddhist philosophy, and consequently both of these, and perhaps also the other two schools which are ranked with them, belong to a period preceding the composition of this Brahma-Sūtra.—The doctrines themselves cannot be recognised with perfect distinctness, and their affinity, although undeniable, to the doctrines of the Sāṃkhya system is still enveloped in some obscurity.† On this point, however, so much is clear, that, although Buddha himself may actually have been in full harmony with the doctrines of Kapila, as they then existed,† yet his adherents developed these in their own fashion, in the

* Whether now, after these words of Burnouf's, loc. cit., p. 522 Lassen's view (*J. A. K.*, ii. 458) is tenable—to the effect that "although in the collection bearing the name of Abhidharma, there are writings of various dates, yet they must all be assigned to the period preceding the third council" (this third council in a.c. 275 being here expressly distinguished from the fourth under Kanishka)—appears to me in the very highest degree doubtful.

† Cf. for this *J. St.*, iii. 132, Max Müller *Geschichte der Arier*, i. 234 ff (1867) Köppel, i. 214 ff.—
† The extinction, the 'blowing out' of

of individual existence was certainly the goal to which Buddha aspired hardly. However, the reaching of this existence into nothing but only its return to the same state of undyed or unconsciousness which belonged to primal matter before it attained to development at all," *L. C. St.*, 1837 p. 770 (*J. St.*, ii. 132) Childers thinks differently, *Pali Dict.*, s. v. *sandha*.

† Were he really to be ident. 5-2 with the Śāṅkara of the *Maitrayani Upanishad* (see p. 97) we should have in this work tolerably direct evidence to the above effect.

same way as the followers of Kapila also pursued their own path, and so eventually that system arose which is now extant under the name Samkhya, and which differs essentially from the Buddhist philosophy* To the four schools into which, as we have just seen, this philosophy was split up at a comparatively early period, four others were afterwards added—or perhaps these superseded the former—but neither have the doctrines of these later schools been as yet set forth with anything like sufficient certainty²⁰² The question, too, whether Buddhist conceptions may not perhaps have exercised a direct influence on the development of Gnostic doctrines,[†] particularly those of Basilides, Valentinian, and Bardesanes, as well as of Manes, must for the present be regarded as wholly undetermined,²⁰³ it is most intimately bound up with the question as to the amount of influence to be ascribed to Indian philosophy generally in the shaping of these doctrines The main channel of communication, in the case of the latter was through Alexandria, the Buddhist missionaries, on the contrary, probably mostly came from the Panjab through Persia.

Besides the three Pitakas, the Sanskrit manuscripts that have been procured from Nepál contain other works also, consisting, in part, of a large number of commentaries on and elucidations of the Pitakas in part, of a

* Whether vv 9-11 of the 130 parished are to be taken with the commentator, as specially referring to the Buddhists as I assume in *J. Sl.*, i 298 299, appears to me doubtful now the polemic may simply be directed against the Sárphikya tenets in general

²⁰² Our information regarding them is derived exclusively from Hodgson's Essays (now collected see note 345) Their names Svābhāvika, Aśvarika Kārmika, Yātnika, are so far unsupported by any other literary evidence Only for the names Sautrāntika Vaibhāshika, Mādhyamika, Yogācāra, is such testimony found Tāranātha for example, is acquainted with these latter only and they are also the only ones known to the Arabic writers

special work on Tibetan and Chinese Buddhism. See on this point *Lit. C. EL.*, 1875 p 550

[†] See F. Neve, *L'Antiquité Chrétienne en Orient*, p 90, Louvain 1852.

²⁰³ Cf. now Lassen *J. A. H.*, iii 357-416 mv *Ind. Skiz.*, p 64, Renan, *Hist. de Long. Sem.* 2d ed 1858, pp 274, 275 That their influence upon the growth of the doctrines of Manes in particular was a most important one is shown, for example, by this circumstance alone, that the formula of abjuration for those who renounced these doctrines expressly specifies Boddā and the Tridivānos (seemingly a separation of Buddha Śākyamuni into two)—Lassen ii 415—Cf. also Beal *J. R. A. S.* ii 424 (1856)

most peculiar class of writings, the so-called Tantras, which are looked upon as especially sacred, and which stand precisely upon a level with the Brahmanical works of the same name. Their contents are made up of invocations of various Buddhas and Bodhisattvas, as also of their Śaktis, or female energies, with a motley admixture of Śivaïtic deities, to which are added longer or shorter prayers addressed to these beings, and directions how to draw the mystic diagrams and magic circles that secure their favour and protection ²⁵⁴

²⁵⁴ Cf. Emil Schlagintweit's *Buddhismus im Tibet* (1863, with a folio atlas of twenty plates).—Recently there have also come from Nepál Sanskrit MSS containing works of

poetry, as to which see Kiatt in the preface to his edition of the sentences of Chinakya, taken therefrom (1873)

SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES.

in the Brihaddevata, 3 24, between Rik-Samh. 1 73 and 74. For, according to Meyer, their *prattikas* prove to be identical with those given by the scholast on Śāṅkh. Śr. 9 20 14, for the '*trīṣatam suparnam*' there mentioned in the text, which again is specified under this name in the Śāṅkh. Br itself (18. 4) as part of the Āśvina-śāstra. Probably, too, the other portions of text, which, as stated by Meyer (l c, p xxv ff), appear in the Brihaddevata as well as in the Rgvidhana, as belonging to the Rik-Samhitā, whereas they are found neither in the vulgate—the Śākals-Samhitā—itsself, nor in its *khila* portions, will have to be assigned to the Vāshkalas. In point of fact, the *saṃjñāna khila* also, to which (see above) the concluding verse of the Vashkala-Samhitā belongs, is mentioned in both texts (Meyer, p xxii.) An exact comparison of the Rik-verses cited in the Śāṅkhāyana texts will probably throw full light upon this point.—In Buhler's letter from Kashmir (published in *I St.*, xiv 402 ff.) the interesting information was given that he had there discovered an excellent *bhūrja*-MS., some five to six hundred years old, of the Rik-Samhitā in the Śākala recension. This MS is accentuated, whereas the Kashmir Vedic MSS are not wont to be so, but the accent is denoted in a totally different manner from that customary in India, the *udātta* alone being marked by a perpendicular line, precisely as, according to Haug, is usual in one of the two schools of the Maitrāyaṇī Samhitā, and as we ourselves do, cf my remarks in the *Jenaer Lit Zeit.*, 1875, p 315. On this MS see now the detailed report of Buhler's journey in the *Journal Bomb Br R A S.*, 1877, extra No, pp 35, 36.

Pp 35, 36, note §. See also Myrmantheus, *Die Áśvins* (Munich; 1876), and James Darmesteter, *Ormuzd et Ahriman* (Paris, 1877).

P 41, note ²² See Alfred Hillebrandt, *Varuna und Mitra, ein Beitrag zur Exegese des Veda* (Breslau, 1877).

P 43, note ²² Max Müller's issue of the text alone of the Rik has now appeared in a second edition (London 1877) *Samhitā-pāṭha* and *pada-pāṭha* are here printed on opposite pages. Respecting the latter it has to be remarked that, as in Müller's previous editions, so again in this one the so-called *galitha* are in no way marked, the text which a particular passage shows the first time

it occurs being uniformly simply repeated, without any reference to what is done in the MSS themselves in these cases. This is all the more surprising as, after I had pointed out this defect, in my review of the last volume of his large edition in the *Int Cent Blatt*, 17th April 1875, Muller himself, in an article which appeared in the same periodical a year and a half later (16th December 1876) fully recognised the critical importance of the *galitas*—Aufrecht's edition has also been reprinted (Bonn, 1877) the preface (comp desideratum at note 28) contains a variety of critical remarks—Complete translations of the Rik-Samhita, by Alfred Ludwig (Prag, 1876) and Hermann Grassmann (Leipzig, 1876-77) have appeared—Very meritorious, also, is the edition of the Rik-Samhitā which is appearing in monthly numbers at Bombay, under the title 'Vedarthayatra,' with English and Mahrathi translation, as well as with Mahrathi commentary the latest No brings it down to 1 100. The name of the excellent editor, Shankar Pandit, is an open secret—Lastly, there remains to be mentioned M Haug's *Vedische Räthselfragen und Räthselfprüche* (Rik, 1 164, 1876)

P 48, note ^{23a} Rājendra Lāla Mitra's edition, in the *Bibl Indica*, of the Āitareya-Āranyaka with Sāyana's commentary, has now been completed. A MS acquired by Buhler in Kashmīr shows a number of variations, see his Report of Journey, *l c*, p 34.

P 50, ⁶ (cf p 285) Pañchālachanda appears in a Pali Sutta among the *mahāsēnāpatīs* of the Yakkhas, for the conclusions to be drawn from this see *Jenae Lit Zeit*, 7th April 1877, p 221

P 56, ⁸ The Śāṅkh Gṛih (4. 10 3) inserts between Viśvāmitra and Vamadeva, the two representatives of the third and fourth *mandalas*, the name of Jamadagni, to whom in the Anukramanī to the Śākhala-Samhita only the last three verses of the third *mandala* (iii. 62, 16-18) are in this place ascribed,—but in addition to these, also five entire hymns and four separate verses in the last three *mandalas*. Have we here also to do with a divergence of the Vashkala school? (In Śāṅkh Gṛih., 4. 5 8, however, there is no trace of this variation from the vulgate, rather, the verse iii 62 18 appears there as the concluding verse of the third *mandala*.)

P 58, note ⁵⁰ The *Saṅkh Grihya* has been published, with translation and notes, by Herm Oldenberg, see *I St*, xv 1-166 There exists also another recension of it, which is designated as *Kaushitaka-Grihya*, but which, according to Oldenberg, is rather to be understood as *Sāmbavya-Grihya*. Its text is 'nowise identical' with the *Śāṅkh Grih*, 'but it has borrowed from the latter by far the greatest part both of its matter and form' The last two books of the *Śāṅkh Grih* are not used in it, and a great deal is lacking besides

P 61, note * On the *Jyotisha* a very meritorious work has just appeared by G Thibaut.

P 62, 6, 26 ff On the *Bṛhaddevata* and *Rigvidhāna* see R. Meyer's edition of the latter work (Berlin, 1877).

P 65, 25 The forty-eighth *Atharva-pariśishta*, see *I St*, iv 432, gives indeed the same beginning, but a different concluding verse to the *Sama-Samhitā*, namely, the last verse but one of the *first* part of the vulgate, accordingly, it did not reckon the second part as belonging to the *Samhitā* at all, while for the first part also it presents the discrepancy stated

P 65, note ⁶⁰ The *Āraṇya-Samhitā*, with *Saṃana's* commentary, has been edited by Satyasvata Samaśramin, and that in a double form, namely, separately (Calcutta, 1873), and also in the second part of his large edition of the *Sama-Samhitā*, p 244 ff

P 66, note ⁶¹ This edition of the *Sama-Samhitā*, in the *Bibl Indica*, has now reached, in its fifth volume, as far as 2 8 2 5

Pp 73 74 The *Talavakāra-* or *Jaṃiniya-Brahmana*, to which the *Kenopan* belongs, has been recovered by Burnell (letter of 19th April) Also a *Samaveda-Pratiśakhya*.

Pp 74, 75, notes ⁷¹, ⁷² The *Ārsheya-Brahmana* and *Samhitopanishad-Brahmana* have also been edited by Burnell (Mangalore, 1876, 1877), the former with a lengthy introduction containing an inquiry into the *Ganas*, the secondary origin of the *Samhitā* from these, the chanting of the *sāmans*, &c On this compare A. Barth's detailed notice in the *Revue Critique*, 21st July 1877, pp 17-27 The *Ārsheya-Brahmana* has, further, just been issued a second time by Burnell, namely, in the text of the *Jai*

miniya school, which he had meanwhile recovered (Mangalore, 1878)

Pp 99-101 According to the catalogue (1876) of M Haug's collection of MSS, there are now in the Royal Library at Munich, with which this collection was incorporated in the spring of 1877, not only two MSS of the Maitrayani Samhita, but also several more or less complete, but, unfortunately, in great part modern, copies of Apastambī, Manava, Bharadvāja, Baudhayana, Vaikhānasa, Hiranyakeśin—The description (in notes 108, 109) of the Dharma-Sūtras as part of the Śrauta-Sūtras is not quite correct, rather both are portions, possessing an equal title, of a collective Sūtra-whole, to which in each case there also belonged a Grihya- and a Sulva-Sūtra, and which we might perhaps designate by the name of Kalpa-Sūtra—[The North-Western origin of the Katha school (cf *Katha*, I St, xiii 439) is also, in a certain measure, attested by the fact that, according to Buhler's letter from Kashmir (dated September 1875, published in I St, xiv 402 ff) on the results of his search for MSS in that province, this school is still in the present day the prevailing one in Kashmir The Brahmins there call themselves, it is true, *chaturvedī*, but they follow the rules of the Kathaka-Grihya-Sūtra of Laugakshi Besides portions of all the Vedas, the Bhattas learn by heart the Paddhati of Devapala, the commentary and *prayoga* to the Kathaka-Grihya 'Of these Grihyas I have acquired several MSS, among them an old one on *bhūṛja*. To the Kathaka-Sūtra are attached a Pravaradhyaya, an Ārsha, the Chitrayaniya Śiksha, and several other *Parīśiṣṭas*'—Additional note in second German edition] According to Buhler, *Z D M G* xiii 327, the Dharma-Sūtra of the Kathaka school is identical with the Vishnu-Smṛiti On this, and on the Kathaka school in Kashmir generally, see now Buhler, Report of Journey, I c, pp 20, 36, 37

P 103, note ¹¹⁶ The Taitt Pratiśakhya has also been cited in the *Bibl Indica* by Rajendra Lala Mitra (1872)

Pp 117, 118 The forty-eighth Atharva-Parīśiṣṭa specifies a recension of the Vaj Samh, which begins with 1 1, but which ends with 23 32' See I St, iv 432

P 114 For the formula *Ambe ambike 'mbālike*, which differs in all three Yajus texts, Panini (vi. 7 118)

has a fourth reading, on this and the other points of connection between Panini and the vocabulary of the Yajus texts, see *I St.*, iv 432

P 138, ²³. According to Mahavamsa, p 9, ^{12, 15}, the name of Buddha's wife was Bhadda- or Subhadda-Kachchānā!

P 139, note ¹⁴⁷ Śatap., 3. 1, 1-2 2, is translated in Bruno Lindner's dissertation, *Ueber die Dikshā* (Leipzig, 1878), other portions in Delbrück's *Altind. Wortfolge* (1878).

P 142, note ¹⁵⁵ The Paraskara has been edited by Stenzler (1876)

P. 150, note ¹⁵⁵ In the forty-eighth Atharva-Parishista, the commencement of the Atharva-Samhita is given just as in the published recension, but it ends there with Book xvi., see *I St.*, iv 432

P 151, note ¹⁵⁶. With the *dashapati* compare the *pāpman āsura* in the Nṛsiṃhop., see *I St.*, ix 149, 150.

P 153 ff. Cf. Paul Regnaud *Matériaux pour servir à l'Histoire de la Philosophie de l'Inde*, 1876, and my review of this work in the *Jenaer Lit Zeit* of 9th February 1878

P 182, note ¹⁹³ The dates of the Nepalese MSS apparently reach back as far as A.D. 883! See Dan. Wright, *History of Nepal*, 1877, *Jenaer Lit Zeit.*, 1877, p 412.

Pp 187, 188, note ^{201a} On Olshausen's explanation of the word *Pahlav*—the basis of the Indian *Pahlava*—from *Parthava*, 'Parthians,' see now also Th Nöldeke in *Z D M G.*, xxxi 557 ff.

P. 189, note ²⁰⁴ According to Kern, *Oer de oud-Javaansche Vertaling van't Mahābhārata* (Amsterdam, 1877), p 7 ff, the Kāvī translation of the *Adi-parvan*, from which he there communicates the text of the *Paushyacharita*, dates from the beginning of the eleventh century

P 189, note ²⁰⁵ For the criticism of the *Maha-Bharata*, Holtzmann's researches (*Indische Sagen*, Preface, Stuttgart 1854) are also of great importance.

P 191, note ²²⁰ The Index to Hall's edition of Wilson's translation of the *Vishnu-Purana* (vol. v part ii.) appeared in 1877. The edition of the *Agni-Purana* in the *Bibl Ind* has now reached *adhy* 294.

P 195, ¹⁵ The identity of the author of the *Raghu-vamśa* and *Kumara-sambhava* with the dramatist *Kalidasa* is contended for by Shankar Pandit in the *Transactions*

of the London Congress of Orientalists (London, 1876), p 227 ff

P 196, note ²⁰⁸ Bharavi and Kalidasa are mentioned together in an inscription of Pulakesi II, 'in the Śaka year 507 (A D 585-6),' at that date, therefore, they must have been already famous See Bhau Dān in *Journ. Bomb Br R A S*, ix. 315, and J F Fleet in *Ind. Antiq*, v 68—On the Kashmir poets Chandraka and Mentha, of about the fifth (?) century, Ratnakara of the ninth, Kshemendra and Bilhana of the eleventh, Somadeva, Maṅkha, Kāhana, &c., of the twelfth century, see Buhler, Report of Journey, I c, p 42 ff

P 199, note † For the text of these Suttas see now Grimblot, *Sept suttas Pālis* (Paris, 1876), p 89, 'nachcham gītam vāditaṃ pekkhaṃ akkhānaṃ iti vā iti eva rūpā vīsūkadassanā' (exhibitions, p 65, spectacles, pp 179, 215) From this it appears that the word here properly in question is not so much the general term *vīsūka* as rather, specially, *pekkhā* (*prekshya*), 'exhibition,' 'spectacle,' translated by 'theatricals,' pp 65, 179, 'representations dramatiques,' p 215, comp. *prekshanaka* as the name of a species of drama in Bharata (Hall, *Dasārūpa*, p 6), and *drīśya* in the *Sahitya-darpana* as the name of dramatic poetry in general

Pp 200, ¹², 205, ²⁰. According to Hall, *Vasavad*, Intro, p 27, Bhavabhūti would have to be placed earlier than Subandhu, and if so, of course, *a fortiori*, earlier than Bana the latter, however, does not allude to him in the classic passage in the introduction to the *Harsha-charita*, where he enumerates his predecessors (Hall, *ibid*, pp 13, 14) See also *Ind Streifen*, I. 355

P 201, note ¶ According to Lassen, *I AK*, iii. 855 1163, Bhoja died in 1053 An inscription of his in the *Ind Antiq*, 1877, p 54, is dated in the year 1022

P 203, note. According to Buhler, *Ind Antiq*, v 112 (April, 1876), a grant of King Jayabhata is 'older than the year 445 A D, and dated in the Vikrama era.'

P 204, note ²¹¹ In *Z D M G*, xxx. 302, Jacobi cites from the *Urvaśi* a (chronometrical) *datum* betokening Greek influence

P 207, note ²¹³ Of new publications, &c., of Indian dramas have to be mentioned Bhandarkar's edition of the

Malati-madhava (Bombay, 1876), Cappeller's edition of the Ratnavali (1877, in the second edition of Bohtlingk's *Sanskrit-Chrestomathie*), the Bengali recension of the Śakuntalā, edited by Pischel (see Cappeller in the *Jenaer Lit Zeit*, 1877, p 121), the two latter dramas translated by Ludw Fritze, lastly, Regnaud's translation of the Mrichhakatika (Paris, 1876).—On the question as to the various recensions of Kālidasa's Śakuntalā—discussed in *I St*, xiv 161 ff—see also Buhler's Report of Journey, *l c*, p lxxxv ff, where the first act of the Kashmir recension of this drama is printed.

P 210, note ²⁰ To this place also belongs Śrīvara's Subhāshitavali of the fifteenth century, containing quotations from more than 350 poets, see Buhler, Report of Journey, *l c*, p 61 ff, further, the Subhāshita ratnakara by Krishna Shastri Bhatawadekar (Bombay, 1872)—Here, too, have to be mentioned the four papers *Zur Kritik und Erklärung verschiedener indischer Werke*, published by O Bohtlingk in vols vii and viii of the *Mélanges Asiatiques* of the St Petersburg Academy (1875-76)

P. 212, note ²² Comp Benfey's Introduction to Bickell's edition and translation of the 'Kalilag und Damnag' (Leipzig, 1876) It now appears doubtful whether the ancient Pahlavi version really rested upon one individual work as its basis, or whether it is not rather to be regarded as an epitome of several independent texts, see my notice of the above work in *Lit C Bl*, 1876, No 31, Buhler, Report of Journey, p 47, Prym in the *Jenaer Lit Zeit*, 1878, Art 118

P 213, note ²¹ Read 'recast by Kshemendra.' It is only to Kshemendra that the statements from Buhler's letter, given in the next sentence, refer Buhler now places him in the second and third quarter of the eleventh century, Report of Journey, *l c*, p 45 ff

P 213 On the Rāja-tarangini see now Buhler, Report of Journey, pp 52-60, lxxi-lxxxii (where an amended translation of I 1-107 is given), and on the Nīla-mata, of about the sixth or seventh century, *ibid*, p 38 ff, iv ff

P 214, note ²³ The Harsha charita appeared at Calcutta in 1876, edited by Jivananda.—On the Smhāsana-jvainsūka see now my paper in *I St*, xv 185 ff

P 215, note ²⁷ In the interpretation of Indian inscrip-

tions, Bühler and Fleet also, in particular, have of late done very active service (especially in *Ind Antiq*, vols v, vi.)

P 221, note ²²³ Goldstucker's 'facsimile' (comp note ¹⁹⁶, p 100) edition of the *Manavakalp* is not 'photo-lithographed,' but lithographed from a tracing

P 226, note ²²³ Kielhorn has come forward with great vigour in defence of the *Mābhāṣya*, first, in a lengthy article in the *Ind Antiq*, v 241 (August 1876), next in his Essay, *Kātyāyana and Patanjali* (Bombay, December 1876), which deals specially with the analysis of the work into its component parts, and, lastly, in his edition of the work itself, which exhibits the text critically sifted; in direct reference thereto (the first number, Bombay, 1878, gives the *naidhnikam*) Cf, further, two articles by Bhandarkar, *On the Relation of Kātyāyana to Pāṇini*, and of *Patanjali to Kātyāyana* in *Ind Antiq*, v 345 ff (December 1876), and on *Goldstucker's Theory about Pāṇini's Technical Terms* (reprint of an earlier review of G's *Pāṇini*), *ibid*, vi 107 ff To this place also belongs an article on the *Mābhāṣya*, which was sent off by me to Bombay on 9th October 1876, but which only appeared in the *Ind Antiq* vi 301 ff, in October 1877

P 226, note ²²³ On the antiquity of the *Kaśika* see now Bühler's Report of Journey, p 72 The issue of the work in the *Pandit* is perhaps by this time completed It is to be hoped that it will appear in a separate edition—Bühler's information regarding Vyādi, the *Mābhāṣya*, *Katantra*, &c, is given in detail in his Report of Journey—On Burnell's essay, *On the Aindra School of Sanskrit Grammarians* (1875), which contains rich materials, see my critique in the *Jenais Lit Zeit*, March 1876, p 202 ff—Of Hemachandra's *Prakrit Grammar* Pischel has given us a new edition (Halle, 1877, text and good index of words)

P 229, note † This note, according to Barth, *Revue Critique*, 3d June 1876, is to be cancelled, as *paraître* can only have the sense of 'seem' (*scheinen*)

P 231, note ²¹³ On Kaśhemendra's *Loka-prakāśa* see Bühler, Report of Journey, p 75

P 231, ²² See note above to p 182

P 231, note ²¹⁴ The translation of the *Sahitya darpana* in the *Libl Indica* is now finished—For the rich informa-

tion supplied by Bühler regarding the Alamkāra literature in Kashmir, see his Report of Journey, p 64 ff. According to this, the Alamkāra-śāstra of Bhaṭṭa Udbhata dates from the time of Jayāpīḍa (779-813), whose *sabhapati* the author was. Vāmana, too, in Bühler's opinion, belongs to the same period. Ānandavardhana and Ratnākara belong to the ninth century, Mukula to the tenth, Abhinavagupta to the beginning, Rudrata to the end, of the eleventh, while Ruyyaka flourished at the commencement, and Jayaratna at the close, of the twelfth century, Mammata is to be placed still later.

P 235, note ²⁷ Of the Sarva-darśana samgraha there is now a translation, by Cowell and Gough, in the *Pandit*, 1875 ff.

P 237, note ²⁰ The Śāmkhya-tattva-pradīp has been translated by Govindadevaśāstrin in the *Pandit*, Nos 98 ff.

P 237, note ²¹ Abhinavagupta was still living in A.D 1015, Bühler, Report of Journey, p 80.—The Śiva-śāstra in Kashmir, *ibid*, pp 77-82, is divided into two groups, of which the one connects itself with the Spanda-śāstra of Vasugupta (854), the other with the Pratyabhijñā-śāstra of Somānanda (ab 900) and Utpala (ab 930). It is of the latter—which appears to rest upon Śāmkara—that Abhinavagupta is the leading representative.

P 241, note ²⁶ The last number of this edition of Śābarasvamin brings it down to 10 2 73, the edition of the Jaiminiya-nyaya mala-vistara has just been completed by Cowell. The Jaimini-sūtra is being published in the Bombay monthly periodical, 'Śraddhārśana chintanika,' begun in January 1877—text and commentary with a double translation, in English and Mahrāthī.

P 243, note ²⁹ Vachaspathiśāstra's Bhāmatī, a gloss on Śāmkara's commentary on the Vedānta-sūtra, is in course of publication in the *Bibl Ind* edited by Bālśāstrin,—commenced in 1876.—In the *Pandit* for 1876, p 113, in the Preface to his edition of Śrīnivāsadaśa's Yatīndra-mata-dīpika, Rāmamiśraśāstrin cites a passage from Rāmānuja's Brahmasūtra-bhāṣya, in which the latter mentions the *bhagavad-Bodhayan* as his predecessor therein, and as separated from him by several generations of *purvaśākyas*. As such *purvaśākyas* Rāmamiśra gives the names of Dramiḍa, Guhradeva, and Brahmaṇandi, at the same time

designating them by the epithets *maharshi* and *supra* *atara*. By Śrīnivasadaśa himself (p. 115) the teachers are mentioned in the following order: Vyāsa, Bodhayana, Guhadeva, Bharuchi, Brahmanandi, Dravidacharya, Śrī-Parāṅkusaṇṭha, Yamunamuni, Yatisvara.—Here is also to be mentioned the edition in the *Pandit*, by Vechana-ramaśāstrin, of two commentaries on the Vedānta sūtra, viz., the Śaiva-bhāṣya of Śrīkantha Sivacharya (see *Z D M G*, xxvii. 166), and the Vedānta kṛustubha prabha of Keśava Kāśmīrablatta.—Further, in the second edition of his *Sanskrit-Chrestomathie* (1877) Bohtlingk has given a new translation of the Vedānta-sāra, and the Vidvan-manoraṅginī of Ramatīrtha, a commentary thereon, has been published, text with translation, in the *Pandit* by Gough and Govindadevaśāstrin. In the same journal has also appeared the Advaita-makaranda of Lakṣmīdhara.

P. 245, note ²⁵². A translation, by Keśavaśāstrin, of the Nyāya-darśana and of Vatsyāyana's commentary thereon, has begun to appear in the *Pandit* (new series, vol. 11). The fourth book of Gaṅgeśa's Nyāya-chintamani with the commentary of Ruchidatta, has also been edited, *ibid* (Nos. 66-93) by Balāśāstrin.

P. 247, note ²⁵³. Of importance are the names, communicated to me from Albirūnī by Ed. Sachau of the *merānī* in Soghd and Khvarizm, the list of which begins with *tharuyā*, i.e., with *kritikā*, and that under the name *garri*, by this is evidently meant *parvā*, i.e., the name which stands *third* in the Bundehesh, whence it necessarily follows that the list of names in the latter is the modern one, commencing with *āśvini*, see *Jenacr Lit Zeit* 1877 (7th April), p. 221. Some of the names here cited by Albirūnī are distinctly Indian, as *frshābath*, i.e., *prōthapada*, the ancient form of name consequently, (not *shadrapadā*). Here, too, presumably, as in the case of China, the Buddhists were the channel of communication.

Pp. 250-251, note ²⁷¹. The proposition laid down by H. Jacobi in *Z D M G*, xxv. 306, that no Indian writings, which enumerate the planets in the order—Sun, Moon, Mars, &c.—can have been composed *earlier* than the third century A.D., has application to Yajñavalkya as well as to the Atharva-pariśiṣṭas, which in point of fact already ob-
vies this order *see I S* v. 317

P 253 note * The absence of mention of the Romakas in the Ramayana may perhaps also rest upon geographical grounds, namely, on the probable origin of the poem in the east of India in the land of the Kosalas, whereas the 'war-part' of the Mahā-Bharata was in all likelihood composed in Central, if not in Western India.

P 256, note ²¹ Cf Thibaut's paper 'On the Śulva-sūtras' in the *Journ As Soc Bengal*, 1875 (minutely discussed by Mr Cantor in the hist lit. div of the *Zeitsch für Math und Physik*, vol. xxi), and his edition of the Śulva-sūtra of Baudhayana with the commentary of Dvārakānāthayyan (text with translation) in the *Pandit*, May, 1875-77.

P 256, note * The explanation of the Indian figures from the initial letters of the numerals has recently been rudely shaken, see Buhler in *Ind Ant*, vi. 48,—through the deciphering, namely, of the ancient 'Nagari numerals' by Pandit Bhagvānlal Indrajī, *ibid.*, p. 42 ff. These, it appears, turn out to be *other* letters, yet the derivation of the later figures from them can hardly be called in question. What principle underlies these ancient numerals is, for the rest, still obscure. The zero has not yet a place among them, there are letter-symbols for 4-10 (1-3 being merely represented by strokes) for the tens up to 90, and for the hundreds up to 1000. Comp pp 222, note ²³, and 257, note ²³¹.

P 260, note * The remainder of the Yatrī has now been edited by Kern in *I St.*, xiv and xv.

P 266 ff. In complete opposition to the former dreams about the high antiquity of Indian medicine, Haas has recently, in *Z D M G*, xix. 617 ff and xxxi. 617 ff, characterised even the most ancient of the Indian medical texts as quite modern productions, to be traced to Arabian sources. In the accounts given by the Arabs themselves of the high repute in which Indian medicine stood with them, and of the translation of works of the kind, which are specified by name, from Sanskrit into Arabic, he recognises hardly any value. As regards the latter point, however, there exists absolutely no ground for throwing doubt upon statements of so definite a character made by the old Arab chroniclers, while, with respect to the former point the language of Śaśruta, Charaka &c, is distinctly

opposed to the assignment to them of so late a date. At the same time, every real proof of the presence of Greek (or even Arabian) conceptions in the works in question will have to be thankfully received. But the early existence of medical knowledge in India would in no way be prejudiced thereby, as its beginnings are well attested by evidence from the Vedic period, especially from the Atharvaveda.

P 270, note ³¹⁰ Charaka, as Buhler informs me, has now also been printed at Bombay, edited by Dr. Anand Mureshwar Kunte, Grant Medical College.

P 271, note ³¹³ The Kavi translation of the Kāmandakī-nīti probably belongs at the earliest, to about the same date as the translation of the Maha-Bharata, see remark above to note ²⁹¹—Progress has been made with the printing of Nirapekshī's commentary in the *Bibl Indica*.

P 273, note ³¹⁹ On modern Indian music, see now the numerous writings of Sourindro Mohun Tagore, Calcutta, 1875 ff., cf. *Jenaer Lit. Zeit.*, 1877, p. 487.—It is possible that the investigation of the *gānas* of the Sama-veda, in case these are still in actual use and could be observed, might yield some practical result for the ancient *laukika* music also.

P 274, note ³²¹ For such representations of Venus, supported on the tail of a dolphin or with a dolphin and Cupid behind her, see J. J. Beinauili, *Aphrodite* (Leipzig, 1873), pp. 245, 370, 405. See also numerous representations of the kind in the *Musée de Sculpture par le Comte F. de Clarac* (Paris, 1836-37), vol. IV, pl. 593, 607, 610, 612, 615, 620, 622, 626-628, 634.

P 278, note ³²⁷ Buhler has also published a translation of *Āpastamba*. It is now being reprinted in the series of 'Sacred Books of the East' which is appearing under Mr. Muller's direction.—Gautama has been edited by Stenzler (London, 1876), and is also comprised in Jivānanda's large collection 'Dharmashastrasamgraha' (Calcutta, 1876), which, all inaccuracies notwithstanding, is yet a very meritorious publication, on account of the abundance of material it contains. It embraces 27 large and small Smṛiti-texts, namely, 3 *Ātris*, 2 *Vishnus*, 2 *Hautas*, *Yajñavalkya*, 2 *Uṛvis*, *Āngiras*, *Yama*, *Āpa*

stamba, Samvarta, Kátyáyana, Brihaspati, 2 Paraś'ra, 2 Vyásas, Śaṅkha, Likhita, Daśha, 2 Gautamas, and 2 Vasishthas—Nārada's Smṛiti has been translated by Jolly (London, 1876), see also his papers, *Ueber die rechtliche Stellung der Frauen bei den Indern* (Munich, 1876), and *Ueber das indische Schuldrecht* (Munich, 1877)

P 280, note ³²² The Aruna-Smṛiti, Buhler informs me, is quite a late production, probably a section of a Purana.

P 281 As Yānuavalkya enumerates the planets in their Greek order (p 295) the *earliest* date we can assign to this work is the third century A.D. (see remark above to p 251, note ²⁷⁴, following Jacobi)

P 284, 5. See remark on Pañchálachanda above, note to p 50

P 288 E. Senart, in his ingenious work, *La Légende du Bouddha* (Paris, 1875), traces the various legends that are narrated of Buddha (and in part, identically, of Krishna also) to ancient solar myths which were only subsequently applied to Buddha, comp my detailed notice and partial rejoinder in the *Jenaische Lit Zeit*, 1876 (29th April), p 282 ff

P 291, note † Schiefner's 'Indische Erzählungen,' from the Kāgyur, in vols vii and viii of the *Mélanges Asiatiques* of the St Petersburg Academy, embrace already forty-seven such legends

P 292, note ³¹³ Whether the Buddhaghosha of this inscription is, as Stevenson assumes (p 13), to be identified with the well-known B must still appear very doubtful, as the princes mentioned in the rest of these inscriptions belong to a far older period, see Ehandarkar in the *Transactions of the London Congress of Orientalists* (1876), p 306 ff

P 293, note * *Sept suttas Pālis, tirés du Dīgharī āya*, from the papers of Paul Grimblot, were published by his widow in 1876 (Paris), text with translation.—The second part of Fausboll's edition of the Jātaka appeared in 1877.—The Mahāparinibbāna-sutta was edited in 1874 by Childers in the *Journal R A S*, vols vii and viii a separate impression of it has just appeared The same journal also contains an edition of the Patimokkha by Dickson An edition of the whole Vinaya-pitaka by Herm Oldenberg is in the press

P 297, note ³¹⁹ A collected edition of the sacred Aṅgas

of the Jinas was published last year (1877) at Calcutta by Dharmapatisinhji the text is accompanied with the commentary of Abhayadeva and a *bhāṣā*-explanation by Bhagvan Vajra.

P 300, note ²⁹ On this compare also S Beal *The Buddhist Tripitaka as it is known in China and Japan* (Devonport, 1876)

P 303, note † On possible points of connection between the Avesta and Buddhism see *Journ Lit Sci*, 1877, p 221

P 305, note † In Gautama the word *bhikkhu* appears expressly as the name of the third of the four *āśramas*, in place of it Manu has *yati*.

BEAL 24th Nov 1877



SANSKRIT INDEX

Akṣapāda, 85 245
 akṣara, 'syllable', 15. 16
 — phileo 161
 Agastya, 53 275 (archi.)
 Agni, 31 40 63 157 70 303
 — cāgana, 1.0 (-74)
 — Purāṇa, 191 201 271 272 281
 318
 — rākṣya, 118 120
 Agniśāstra, 265 66 269 (med.)
 Agniśāstra, 79
 agra, 190
 aṅga, 248
 Aṅga, 25 2 6 (a. Vedic) 296
 297 326, 327 (Jam.)
 Angas, 147
 Angir, 158
 Angira, 31 57 153 158 160 162
 164 250 325 (S-mā)
 — (Jupiter) 250
 Angirasa, 124 148 ff
 Ajātasatru, 51 127 138 286 (has
 six teachers)
 — comit, 82
 atakṣaśa, 111
 atthalakṣa, 202
 Atm, 31 33 51 102 103 140 Ved
 — 102 283 325 (jur.)
 — 260 med.
 — daughter of, 38 140
 — brāhṁ, 269 (med.)
 — lākṣ, 269 (med.)
 Atharvan, 151 (as prajapati) 153
 (bṛā paṇi and cāgaraṇi) 153
 164
 — (= A. Veda) 73
 Atharva Parāśara, 2, 2 251 253
 265
 — the forty eighth A. V. Par., 313.
 316 317 318

Atharva-Parāśara, Greek order of
 the planets in the Ath Parāśara,
 323
 — Paṇinī, 153 169
 — Prākṣikṣa, 146 151
 — Veda 8 7 29 145 ff. 249 265.
 — Sukhara, 164.
 — Sūtra, 164 167
 Aśvamedha, 154 166 169 170
 Atharva Śruti, 11 208 318
 Atharvāngirasa, 11 72 93 121
 127 149 150 (see a. ang.)
 Atharvāś, 113 124 148 149
 Atharvopaniṣad, 23 153 ff. 239
 a. h. a. 245 265
 Adhātadharma, 301 (Buddh.)
 Adhātā Brāhmaṇa, 69 152
 adanta, 171
 Advaita makaranda, 323.
 adī idantam, 121
 adhyāyana 121
 adhyāyana, 8
 adhyātman, 121
 Adhyātmaśāstra, 168.
 adhyāya, 14 31 32 107 117
 adhyāyā, 66
 adhyāya, 14 80 149
 adhyāya (pl.), 8 80 86 87 121.
 Ananta, 141 (contin.)
 Anantadeva, 101
 Anantayajvan 85 245
 anapā, 255 (Greek)
 Arakṣama, 24 32 33 61 64 65
 74 83 85 87 88 90 103 104
 107 143 144 145 152
 Arupadī Sūtra, So. 81 84 88 93
 Anubhāṇa, 12 82.
 anubhāṇa, 82.
 Anubhūtiprakāśa 97
 Anubhūtiśāstra, 226

Adal addna, 29
 Adala, 72 121 129 235 277
 Adand-gut, 51 243
 — jūna, 51
 — tiribh, 51
 — vana, 163
 — vardhan, 322
 Anandavallī 94 151 156 157
 Anantīy, 55
 Andhā, 91
 Apastambā, 88, 99 ff 100 101 102
 317 325
 — Eṭa-ā d'ra, 101 102 106 272
 325
 Apāli, 222
 Apr'it' 255 (Greek)
 — caryana, 161
 — bhupr-āṣṭa, 156
 Amora, 261
 āzara, nāṣṭa m 53 120
 Arāsthāna, 3 2
 — ānāda, 2 271
 Arā 254 (Greek)
 Arāzola, 8 28 29 48 92
 — kāda, 118
 — ādāda, 153
 — ānāda, 63
 Arāzāgita, 64 65
 — arāzāzāda 316
 Arād- Arādhā, 285
 Arāṣṭa, 93
 Arun, 51 69 71 123 132 132
 131 157 286
 Arāz'opāzāda, 163 164
 Arunā, 91
 — ānāda, 132 1 7
 — ānāda, 15 16
 Arjuna, 183
 Arjā, 3 79 178
 Arjābhāṣa 61 254 255 257 ff
 Arjābhāṣa, 61 257
 Arjāzāda 257
 Arjāzāda, 237
 Arjāzāda, 257
 Arā 85
 Arāzāpānāda, 162
 Arāzā-Kāṣṭa 75 77
 Arāzā E ānāda, 74 313 316
 ālambāyana, 53
 — ānāda, 259
 Avāntikā, 2 232
 — ānāda, 84 278
 — ānāthā ānāda, 46 53 242
 — ānāthā 53 242
 ānāda — ānāthā 164
 — (ānāthā), 327

— ānāda, 133
 — ānāda, 32 24 47 50 59 62
 — ānāda, 101 102 163 206
 — ānāda, 156
 — Parāzāda, 62
 — Brāhmanā, 27
 — ānāda, 314
 — ānāda, 323
 — ānāda, 128 140
 — ānāda, 128 131 133 137 255
 — ānāda, 113
 — ānāda, 254 (Greek)
 — ānāda (ānāda) (7), 259
 — ānāda, 264 (Arabic)
 — ānāda, 89
 — ānāda, 48
 — ānāda 24 72 93 122 124 127
 159 190 191
 — ānāda, 121 183 321
 — ānāda, 254 (Greek)
 — ānāda, 264 (Arabic)
 — ānāda, 300
 — ānāda, 264 (Arabic)
 — ānāda, 264 (Arabic)
 — ānāda, 32 20 52 63 121 127 172
 (gran m) 186 211 265 (mānā)
 303
 — and Arjuna, 37 50 115 126
 185 186
 — ānāda, 193
 — ānāda, 293
 — ānāda, 133
 — ānāda, 178
 — ānāda, 34 125
 — ānāda, 173
 — ānāda, 108
 — ānāda, 45 110
 — ānāda, 116 155 200
 — ānāda, 238
 — ānāda, 272 mū
 — ānāda, 236 237
 — ānāda, 264 (Arabic)
 — ānāda, 122
 — ānāda, 67 81
 — ānāda, 83
 — ānāda, 91
 — ānāda, 125 135
 — ānāda, 257
 — ānāda 185 201 207 252 257
 259 295
 — ānāda, 226
 — ānāda, 210 226
 — ānāda, 169
 — ānāda, 239 ff
 — ānāda, 207
 — ānāda, 157

Kanya, 3 31 5- 106 105 (plur)
 140.
 — *Sruti Śāstra*, 143
 Kanya, 304.
 Kanti, Kāṇḍyana, 304.
 Kātas, 138
 Kathāsaritasaṅgāra, 213- 217 219
 223
 Kadru, 134.
 Kaniṣka, Kanerka 205 218 210
 220 222, 223 281 285 287 288
 290 294 302 306 308
 Kaniṣkha, 269 (tīya)
 Kanyāśūmāra 157
 Kapardigiri 179
 Kapardivāsin, 42 101
 Kap nala, 211
 Kapila, 96 137 162 235 ff 272
 284 308
 Kpūlavastu, 33 137 284.
 Kapihthala 265 268 (med.)
 — Kotha, 88
 Kapiśhala Samhitā, 80
 Kabandha, 149
 Kabandhin, 159
 Kambaja, 178 220
 Kambala, 264 Arab
 karataka, 205
 karana, 259 (nair)
 — kūtāhala, 261 262
 — adra, 262
 Karavindavāsin, 10
 Karāḍa, 159
 Karka, 141
 Karpātaka, 94.
 Karnāṭa, 276
 Kasmānda, *dāna, 305
 Karmapradīpa, 84 85 278
 Karmamānīśa, 239 ff
 Karmārgha, 153
 kalda (thosixty four), 275.
 Kalāya Śāstra 227 (gramm)
 kalāṁ, 184.
 Kali, 113 283 yuga
 — 113, 205 260 26
 Kalinga, 269
 Kalindha, 272
 Kalīyuga, 243
 Kalki Purāṇa, 191
 Kalpa 16 40 53 75 93 153 (Ath.)
 176 242
 — Kāra 144
 — Subas, 16 34 75 100 100. (V d)
 297 (Jun) 317
 Kalpanapad, 84
 Kalhapa, 213 215 317

Kavaśha, 120
 Kavi, 153 (Uśina) 191 195
 Kaviputra, 204 205
 Kavirdja, 196
 Kai, 4, 140 (having black teeth)
 Kasyapa, 53 140
 — 278 282 jur
 Kashya 78 306
 Kaserumant, 185
 Kabola, 129 133
 Kāśkāyana, 153 (Ath) 266 26)
 (med)
 Kāthaka, 41 81 8, SS 89 ff 103
 317
 — *Grāya*, 101 317
 Kāthālopaniṣad 93 156, 238 240
 Kāṇḍa, 246
 kāṇḍa, 59 5) 91 92 117 ff 145
 Kāṇḍāyana 53
 Kāṇḍa, 103 100 113 ff 142 143
 144 (gramm)
 Kāṇḍa 105
 Kāṇḍiputra 105
 Kāṇḍyāna, 105
 Kāṇḍa 226 227 321
 Kāṇḍa *Grāya*, 142
 Kāṇḍa *Śāstra* 91 99 100 142
 Kāṇḍa 138 223
 Kāṇḍyāna 53 61 80 83 84 10,
 138 ff (Ved) 222 321 (gramm),
 227 lex 266 med 285 (Buddh)
 — *Sruti-Śāstra* of, 143 326
 — Kabandhin, 159
 Kāṇḍa, 127 138, = Durgā,
 138 157
 — putra, 71 138 285
 Kāṇḍāri 213.
 Kāṇḍa-Śāstra, 236
 Kāṇḍa, 126 137 223 236 237 284.
 Kāṇḍakīya (Nīti Śāstra), 271
 325
 Kāṇḍa-Śāstra, 267
 Kāṇḍāyana, 241
 Kāṇḍa, 114 115, 115, 115 138
 Kāṇḍa, 75
 Kāṇḍāyana, 299
 Kāṇḍakāyapa 266
 Kāṇḍakeya, 103 (comm)
 Kāṇḍa 309
 Kāṇḍāyana, 140 211 242
 Kāṇḍa, 248
 Kāṇḍāyana 262
 Kāṇḍāyana 14 81 83 96
 Kāṇḍāyana, 220 221
 Kāṇḍāyanaśāstra, 171
 Kāṇḍa, 89 96

Kālidā 1, 19, 196 200 ff 209 228
 250 252 260, 318 f
 — three Kālidāsas, 201.
 741, 159
 Kāvashya 120 131
 Kāvya, 236
 Kāvya, 183 191 195 210
 Kāvya 36 (Uśana) 153
 Kāvyaśāstra, 204 232
 Kāvyaśāstra 2 232
 Kāvyaśāstrānukṛti 226 232
 Kāśīrit nā, 42 91 140 242
 Kāśīritani, 139 1, 0 242
 Kāśī, 125 250
 Kāśī, 106 130 226 227 321
 Kāśī, 269 285
 Kāśīmitra, 227
 Kāśīyā, 143 (Śrinā) 245 (plu) 275 (archit)
 Kāśīyāśāstra, 237
 Kāśī, 111
 Kāśīyā, 302
 Kāśīyāśāstra, 196
 Kāśīyā, 79
 Kāśīyā, 273
 Kāśīyā, 259
 Kāśīyā, 81
 Kāśīyā, 91
 — (town) 168.
 Kāśīyā Śāstra, 266.
 Kāśīyāśāstra, 146.
 Kāśī, 90
 Kāśī, 3
 Kāśīyāśāstra, 297
 Kāśīyāśāstra, 195 196 208 318
 Kāśīyāśāstra, 68 74 241 242
 Kāśīyāśāstra, 100
 Kāśīyāśāstra, 30,
 Kāśīyāśāstra, 302 303
 Kāśī, 114 123 135 136 137 138 (and Kāśī) 250
 Kāśīyāśāstra, 63 136
 Kāśīyāśāstra, 10, 3, 39 45 68 90 114 129 132 135 186 286.
 Kāśīyāśāstra, 278
 Kāśīyā, 254
 Kāśīyā, 281
 Kāśīyā, 124 203
 Kāśīyā and Lāyā, 197
 Kāśīyā 197
 Kāśīyāśāstra 303
 Kāśīyāśāstra 57 256
 Kāśīyāśāstra, 245 246
 Kāśīyāśāstra, 215

Kāśīyāśāstra 303
 Kāśīyā, 144.
 Kāśīyā, 113 (yuga)
 Kāśīyā, 2 148 247 248 304 323
 — series, date of 2
 Kāśīyāśāstra, 80
 Kāśīyā 266 med
 Kāśīyā, "Śrinā, 197
 Kāśīyā (black) 304.
 Kāśīyā Devakīputra, 71 104 148 169 186 238 284 304
 — and Kāśīyāśāstra, 220 221
 — and the Kāśīyāśāstra, 136
 — and the shepherdes, 210
 — worship of, 71 189 209 238 289 300 304 307 326.
 — Kāśīyā, 71 148
 — Dravīdyāyā, 184 243
 — Asura Kāśīyā, 148 304.
 — Kāśīyā Hārīta, 50
 Kāśīyāśāstra, 54 58
 Kāśīyāśāstra, 207
 Kāśīyāśāstra, 242.
 Kāśīyāśāstra, 266 med
 Kāśīyā, 120 132
 Kāśīyā, 250
 Kāśīyāśāstra, 73, 74 75 156 2 171 316
 Kāśīyāśāstra, 255
 Kāśīyā, 245
 — Kāśīyāśāstra, 245
 Kāśīyā Kāśīyāśāstra, 323.
 Kāśīyā (Asura) 148
 Kāśīyāśāstra, "Śrinā, 148
 "Kāśīyā" Kāśīyāśāstra, 183
 Kāśīyā, 304.
 Kāśīyā, 120
 Kāśīyā, 56 83 93 95 223 224
 Kāśīyāśāstra, 155 16, 169 f
 Kāśīyā, 250
 Kāśīyā, 25.
 Kāśīyā 160 185 192 103 324.
 Kāśīyā, 33 68 1, 7 28,
 — Vāśīyā, 34 34 1, 2 1, 4 136 285
 Kāśīyā, 273.
 Kāśīyāśāstra, 134
 Kāśīyāśāstra 305
 Kāśīyāśāstra 102 285
 Kāśīyā, 77 140
 Kāśīyāśāstra, 97
 Kāśīyāśāstra 47 65 76 83 84 89 90 106
 Kāśīyāśāstra, 140
 Kāśīyāśāstra 241
 Kāśīyāśāstra, 30 123 135 1, 6

Zaurupaśchala, 123
 Zaurupa, 231 (Guruk)
 Zaurupa, 171
 Zaurupa (Zaurupa), 159
 Zaurupa, 173
 Zaurupa, 179 152 153 (Alh)
 — (Gaur), 29
 Zaurupa, 56
 Zaurupa, 46 81
 — Zaurupa, 50 54
 Zaurupa, 46 68 82 133
 134 312
 — Zaurupa, 26 44 ff 71
 — Upaniṣad 50 73 127 155
 286
 Kausastaleya, 129
 Kausastya, 125 159 (S). =
 Kausurubindi 123
 Kauhala, 75
 Kauhala 34 49 60
 Kauhala, 23 (Greek)
 Kauhala, 123
 Kauhala, 93
 Kauhala, 61 metr 153 248
 Kauhala
 Kauhala, 111
 Kauhala, 68
 Kauhala, 200
 Kauhala, 263, med.
 Kauhala, 79 227
 Kauhala 84
 Kauhala, 165
 Kauhala, 213
 Kauhala, 213 215 319 320
 321
 Kauhala, 293
 Kauhala, 77
 Kauhala, 84
 Kauhala, 88
 Kauhala, 79
 Kauhala, 248
 Kauhala, 53 14 81
 Kauhala, 87 88
 Kauhala, 84
 Kauhala, 92 97 107 130 144 249
 313 f
 — Kauhala, 127 128 130 131
 Kauhala, 293
 Kauhala, 165 165 248
 Kauhala, 142
 Kauhala, 246 223
 Kauhala, 225 266 grammar
 Kauhala, 113
 Kauhala, 170
 Kauhala, 154 170
 Kauhala, 15 23 240 241 242

Kauhala, 225
 Kauhala, 15
 Kauhala, 26
 Kauhala, 170
 Kauhala, 142
 Kauhala, 272 (Kauhala) 274 (Pa-
 chala)
 — po seana by a, 126
 Kauhala 70 132 210, 1, 14
 Kauhala, 1, 1 22 (pale)
 — Kauhala, 1 1
 Kauhala, 171
 Kauhala, 153 153 252 ff (astr
 — pale 252 253
 — Viddha, 153 253
 Kauhala, 160 167 272
 Kauhala, 314 315
 Kauhala, 200
 Kauhala, 233
 Kauhala, 51
 Kauhala, 170
 Kauhala, 24 33 43 72 73 63 12
 122 123 127 132 134
 — 299 301 Dada
 Kauhala 63 64 81 316 325
 Kauhala, 271 272
 Kauhala, 140
 Kauhala, 56 127
 — Kauhala, 214 251
 Kauhala, 56 (Griya) 63 (Sima)
 75 (Maha) 143 (gramm) 153
 (Alh)
 — and Kauhala, 221
 — Bilaka, 51
 Kauhala, 210
 — (time of composition), 210
 Kauhala, 213
 Gupta (dynasty), 204
 Guruderaśmim, 101
 Gurjara, 297
 Gurudeva 42 323
 Gurudeva 73
 Gurudeva 115
 Gurudeva, 115
 Gurudeva, 115
 Gurudeva, 31
 Gurudeva 164
 Gurudeva 15 17 19 20 1
 84 101 152 153 214 276 277
 Gurudeva, 301 Buddh
 Gurudeva, 65
 Gurudeva, 264 Arab
 Gurudeva, 41
 Gurudeva, 223 gr 267 (erot)
 Gurudeva, 24 ff (log)
 — Sutra, 215

Godāvarī, 283
 Gonardiya, 223 gr 267 (erut)
 Gopātha Brāhmana, 106 150 151
 152 304
 Gopavanas, 140
 Gopālatāpanīyopaniṣad, 159
 gopī, 169
 Gopichandanopaniṣad, 169
 Gobhila, 80 82 83 84
 — Smṛiti, 280
 goldadhya, 262
 Govardhana, 211
 Govinda, comm, 55 62
 — teacher of Śāṅkhya, 161 243
 — svāmin, 101 comm
 Gauda (style) 232
 Gaudapāda, 161 167 236 243
 298
 Gautama, 77 (two G's)
 — 84 143 (jur)
 — 153 162 (Ath.)
 — 245 (phil)
 — 162 (Rishu)
 — Dharma (Sutra), 85 278 281
 282 325 326 327
 — (Pīṭhmedha Sutra), 84 245
 Gautamah Śāṅkhya, 284
 Gautamas, 137
 grāṇtha, 15 99 165 193
 — (nāḍanasaṃyāna), 81
 graha, 67 (Soma vessel)
 — eclipse, 249
 — planet, 98 249 250
 — (bālagraha) 98
 grāma, 64 77
 Grāmagayagāna, 64 65
 Ghaṭākarpāra, 200 201
 Ghora Aṅgīrasa, 71
 Chatuṣṣaṣṭhīkaldhūtra, 275 (old
 gama)
 chaturāṅga, game of 275
 Chatur-adhyāyikā, 151 (adhyā-
 yikā)
 Chaturvīṅśatismṛiti, 280
 Chandra, 219 227
 Chandraka, 319
 Chandragupta, 4. 204. 217 223
 251 287
 — (Gupta dynasty) 204
 Chandrabhāgā, 260
 Chandra Vyāghraṇa, 227
 Champā, 178
 charaka, 87
 Charaka, 265 266 268 270 284
 324 325 med
 Charaka Sāhita, 89

Charakya, 87 88 164
 Charakābhārya, 87 113
 Charakādūhvarya, 87 133 134
 Charanābhārya, 95 142 153 (Ath.)
 *charitra, 214
 Chākrī, 123
 Chākrāyana, 71
 Chāṇakya, 205 210 260 310
 chandala, 129
 Chānārāta, 193
 chāndanagardhila, 275
 Chāndrabhāgīn, 269
 Śrī Chāpa, 259
 Chārāyānīya, 88 103 317 (Śikṣā)
 Chārvaṅka, 246
 Chālukya, 214
 Chitra, 51
 Chitraratha, 68 (Bāhlikani)
 chitra, 247 248 (series)
 Chintāmanīpīṭh, 217
 Chinas, 243
 Chūda, 130
 Chulīkōpaniṣad, 165
 chela, 138
 Chelaka, 138
 Chaikīśānēya, 138
 Chaikīśāyana, 138
 Chaitrarāthi, 68
 Chaitaki, 133
 Chyavana, 134
 Chhagala, 96 99
 chhandas (Vedic text), 8 14 57
 60 103 176
 — (Sāma Samhitā), 63
 — metr, 25 60 145 272
 Chhandasikā, 63
 Chhandogya, 8 66 81 86 121
 chhandobhāṣā, 103
 chhandovat, 216
 Chhagaleya, 96 102 155, *yina,
 96
 Chhāgeya, 96
 Chhāndogya Brāhmana, 69
 Chhāndogyaopaniṣad, 70 ff 155
 Jaganmohana, 253
 Jātapātala, 60
 Jātākarna, 265 med
 Japaka, 33 53 68 76 123 124
 127 129 131 135 193 237 285
 286 (his six teachers)
 japa (prajapati), 76
 — saṃtārātra, 76
 Janamajaya, 34 123 125 131 134
 135 136 180
 Jānārāda, 303
 Japamālā, 307

- Jamadagni, 152, 312
 Jayatirtha, 42.
 Jayadeva, 210 (date of)
 Jayabhata, 319
 Jayaratha, 322
 Jayardana, 143.
 Jayāditya, Jayāpīṭha, 227 322
 Jāśampadha, 98
 Jalada, 150.
 Jāṭaka, astr., 240. 260.
 Jāṭaka, Buddh., 284. 293. 301 326
 Jāṭakarmān, 19 102. 142.
 Jāṭi, 161.
 Jātākarmāya, 138 139 140 143
 Jānski, 130
 Jābala, 71 130. 132 134. 163. 185
 Jābala, 143 (Śrīya)
 Jābālopanishad, 163. 164. 168
 Jānaka, 255 (Greek)
 Jānaka, 254 (Greek)
 Jānu, 259.
 Jānu, 162.
 Jivagovardhana, 169.
 Jivā, 133
 Jivāśarman 260.
 Juka, 254 (Greek)
 Juman, 240
 Jainas, 214. 217 236 244. 293.
 295 ff
 Jaimini, 55-58 (Grhya) 65 (Śā
 mva) 184. 189 239 ff (phā.)
 — Bhāra, 57 189
 — Śūtra, 240 (astr.) 322.
 Jaiminiya, 65 240. 316 317
 — nyāyavādaśāstra, 241 322.
 Jāvali 71
 Jānabhadhara, 253
 Jānagayana, 91 94
 Jānāśāstra, 201 260. 261
 266.
 Jyotiṣa, 25 30. 60 61 153 (Ara-
 naka) 249. 258. 316
 Jyau, 254 (Greek).
 Jāṭaka, 133.
 Jāṭakāṭika, 185.
 Jāṭakāṭika-Śāstra, 83 84.
 Jāt and team, 162.
 Jāṭopaniṣad, 108 155
 Jāṭikā, 144.
 Jāṭra cāramānā, 167 208 209
 265 282 310
 — grammar, 227 229
 — text-book, 229 (term taken to
 Java) 265 266
 Jāṭa, 263 (Arabic)
 Jāṭa, 158 244.
 Jāṭka, 244.
 Jāṭakāṭika-Brāhmaṇa, 316.
 Jāṭakāṭika, 74.
 Jāṭa, Jāṭa, 263. 264 (Arabic)
 Jāṭa (Śāstra) 263 (Arabic)
 Jāṭam (purdān), 76
 Jāṭam (gr), 243.
 Jāṭika, 70
 Jāṭya, 66 ff 71. 130.
 Jāṭa 127 138
 Jāṭika, 167 ff
 Jāṭakāṭika, 163 6. 168
 Jāṭakāṭika, 248 293 300 309
 Jāṭa nāmāṇa 101
 Jāṭa, 254 (Greek)
 Jāṭa, 144
 Jāṭa, 87 (partidga)
 Jāṭa 41 87 88 90 91
 Jāṭika, 292 293 294.
 Jāṭika 3.
 Jāṭa 248
 Jāṭakāṭika, 167
 Jāṭa, 241
 Jāṭa, 120. 131 (Kāśyaśāstra)
 Jāṭika, 253. 274.
 Jāṭika, Jāṭika, 220 291
 Jāṭika, 12 129
 Jāṭakāṭika, 165 171
 Jāṭika, 81 87, *yāṭa 102 160
 (yāṭa) 317 (Pāṭi)
 — Śāṭa, 83 ff 103 248
 — *yāṭika, 92-94. 238 240
 249 303
 — *yāṭika 93 94
 Jāṭika, 25 (Greek)
 Jāṭika, 241
 Jāṭika, 53
 Jāṭa, 8 45 121 191
 Jāṭika, 68
 Jāṭika, 227
 Jāṭika, 255 (Greek)
 Jāṭika, 292
 Jāṭika, 171
 Jāṭika, 171
 Jāṭika, 151 152
 Jāṭika, 103
 Jāṭika, 21.
 Jāṭika, 62
 Jāṭika, 113 159
 Jāṭika, 56
 Jāṭa and Jāṭa, 182
 Jāṭika, 316 (Śāstra)
 Jāṭa, 213 232
 Jāṭika 190
 Jāṭika, 123 149.
 Jāṭika, 203

- clampati*, 38
Devārāpanishad, 171
der apārnamāsa, 101
Dasakumdra, 'charita, 206 213 250 276
dalai, 63 124 149
Dasatayā, 83 (comm)
dasatayā, plur *dasatayāḥ*, 31 82
Dasapurusham rājya, 123
Dasarupa, 231, 232
Dasarathajātala, 293
Daharasutta, 293
Dākshāyana, 227 228
Dāksh, *Dākshaputra*, 218, 228
Dānava, *Dānu* 302
Dālbhya, 85 (*Parishāṭa*) 143 (gr)
daśaka, 36
Dāśārman, 55
daśajayas, 141
Dānāga, 209 245
Dīvodāsa, 269
dīndīa, 229 304 (*denarius*)
Dipavanta, 288
Duhshanta, 125
aurudhara, 255 (Greek)
Durga, 33 41 42 63
Durgamāha, 226
Durgā, 138, 159
dushkrita, 87
Dushṭaritu 123
drakāna, 255 (Greek)
drūya, 319
Drishadvatī, 67 102
Deva, *Devayājñaka*, *Sri Deva*, 141 142
Devaki, 71
Devakiputra, 71 148 166 169
devajanavāsa, 121
devajanavajñā, 124 183
Devatsādhyāya, 74-75
Devatrāta, 54
Devadatta, 160
Devapāla, 317
Devatājayajñan, 41 42
Devastāmin, 260 (agr)
Devāpi, 39
Devūpanishad, 154 170 171
dhāya, 79
Dawata, 85
Davāpa, 125
daśapāti, 151 318
dyuta 255 (Greek)
Dyanushpitar, 35
Dramida, *Dravidacharya*, 322 323
dramma, 229 (Greek)
draka 79
Drāvida, 94
Drāhyāyana, 53 79 84 282
Drona, 185 271
dudpara, 113 151 243
Dvārakānāthayajñan, 324
Divedagaṅga, 72 104 139
Dvapāyana, a *Kṛishṇa*
Dhanapajaya, 232
Dhanapatiśūn, 243
Dhanurveda, 271, 282
Dhaneśvara, 214
Dhanvantari, 200 265 266 269
Dhanvin, 80
Dhammapada, 293
dhammapaliyādyani, 292 294
Dharma, 176 276 ff.
 — *Sāstras* 159 276-283
 — *Sāstra-samgraha*, 325 326
 — *Sutras*, 19 85 101 277 ff.
 317
dharmas, 101
Dharma, *putra, *rāja, 186
dharmacharya 56
Dāru tarangini, 227
Dhātu pāṭha, -*pāṭhāna*, 230
Dhānapajaya, 76 77 82
Dhārī, 201 202
Dhāvaka, 204 205 207
Dhānirājya, 141
Dhātastāmin, 79 101
Dhātastāmin (*Vaichitravīrya*), 30 90 114
 — king of the *Kāśya*, 125
Dhyanavandupanishad, 165
Dhyānibuddha, 298
dhruvaya prachalanana, 98
nakta (*nakṣa*), 264, Arab
nakshatras, 2 90
Nakshatra-Kalpa, 153
nakshatradarśa, 112
Nagajit, 132 134
Nachiketas, 157
nafa, 196 197 199
 — *Sāstras*, 197 199 271 275
Nanda, 205 117 223
Nandikekhara-Upapurāna, 171
Namin, 68
Naraka, 188
nartaka, 199
Nala, 132 189
Nalodaga, 196
Nagaratna, 201
Narabasta, 101
nāka, 123
Nāgas (*naga*), 273 302

Vigānanda, 207
Nāgārjuna, 224 265 287 288 (date of)
Nāgārjuna, 223 227
Nāgajñāna, 223 224 226
Nāgārjuna, 196
nāṣya, 197 200
 — *Sūtra*, 231
nānaka 205 281
Nādarudrāpanishad, 165
Nārada, 72 (Vel) 153 (*Āth. Par*)
 264 (*astr*) 272 (*etym. and mus*)
 — *pañchadāśī*, 239
 — *Sūtra* 61 272
 — (*Smṛiti*), 278 326
Nārada, 167, *mantra* 167 168
Nārāyaṇa, 94 123 (*puruṣa*) 160
 166 167 303
Nārāyaṇa, 54 (*comm. several N's*)
 38 (*do*) 141 158 ff (*Upa*)
Nārāyaṇopaniṣad, 93 157 166
 167 169 171
Nārāyaṇopaniṣad, 166 170
ndrasaṁs 93 121 122 127
nigama, 8
Niyama Parivṛtta, 25 142 153
Nigantuk, 25 41 153 (*Āth.*)
 227
niya 167
Nichirva, 276
niddāna, 81 (*Ved*) 301 (*Buddh*)
Niddāna-Sūtra, 24 62 77 81 82
Nimi, 68
Nirapekṣa, 325
Nirāmbopaniṣad, 162
Nirukta, **ks* 25 26 41 42 44
 59 62 88 160 167 216 217
 235
Nirvṛti, 152
nirvṛtya 49
nirvṛtā, 161 (*brahma*) 308
 (*Buddh*)
Nisumbha, 206
Nishadha, 132
Nishāda, 77
Niśi Sūtras 210 271 282
Nilakantha, 188 189
Nilamata, 320
Nirarudropaniṣad 171
Nirvṛta, 167 168
 — *idānyopaniṣad* 167 168
Nirvṛta 101 *comm*, 168
Nirvṛta, *Naṣya* 65 85
Nirvṛta Sūtra, 84
Nirvṛtuka, 25 85
Nirvṛta, 81

Narmada, 70
Narmada, **hiya*, 34 45 54 59
 68 185
naigāṅka, 245
Nairuktas 25 85
Nairuktas, 196 232
Nairuktas, 132
Nidya, 159 237 242 245 246
 — *chintamani*, 246 323
 — *darśana*, 244 323
 — *Sūtra*, 85 235 245
Pakṣhilaśāstrin, 244 245
Pañchatantra 206 212 215 221
 229 240 266 267 291 301
pañchadāśī, 122
pañchaparya, 267
pañchamāśrama, 164
pañchalalāṣana, 190
Pañchavṛṇa-Bṛāhmaṇa, 66 ff
Pañchavṛṇa-Sūtra, 83, 84
Pañchavṛṇa, 83 84
Pañchastika, 235 236 237 284
Pañchastika, 259
Pañchāṣṭa, 10 90 114 115 125
 135 136
Pañchāṣṭa, 50 315 326
pañcāṣṭapadārṇava, 34
Pañchāṣṭa Bāhavya, 10 34 (*erot*)
*Pañch*⁴
pañchika, 44
pañala, 59 82 84
Pañcāṣṭa, 126 137 223 236
 237 284
Pañcāṣṭa, 87 219 ff 231 277 301
 (*gr*)
 — 137 223 231 237 ff (*phil*)
**pañha*, 117
padakāra, 91
padapāṣṭha, 23 33 43 49 60
 63
padārṇava, 34
Paddhatis, 55 59 85 102 141
 142 143 145 317
Padma Purāṇa 191
Padmayoni, 153
panaphard, 255 (*Greek*)
Para, 68 125
Paramahansa, **hansopaniṣad*, 163
 164
Paramādiśvara, 257
paramesvara 162
Parāśara, 44 143 185 252 260
 (*astr*) 265 266 (*med*)
 — (*Smṛiti*) 278 280 (*lapu and*
vriddha) 326
Pank, but 136

Paritta, 293 (Buddh)
paribhāṣā, 101 140. 144. 212
 227
Paribhāṣendusekhara, 226
pari-rōṣaṇa, 112 147 164.
Parīśāṭha, 60 62 69 75 84. 85
 101 107 142 146 149 150
 - 151 153 317
Paruṣa, 119 (*Sūtra Br*)
Parthava, 4 188 318
parvan, 66 (*Sāmav*) 124 (*Athar-*
van, &c) 146 149 183 184.
Parśu, 3 (4)
**pariyāyāni*, 292 294.
Parvāna, 272
Paśupatiśarmaṇ, 54.
Pāṭavas, 187 183 318.
Pāṭharāṭra, 238
Pāṭharāṭhya, 83.
Pāṭhāṭha, 267
pāṭhāṭha 34 (*gr*) 232 (*rūṭha*)
Pāṭhāṭhya, 138
Pāṭhi, 133
Pātaliputra, 217 237 251 258.
 290 295
**pāṭhāṭha*, 293. 326
pāṭha, 22 49 103.
Pāṭha, 3 8 12 15 26 41 57 59
 61 77 82 87 216-222 232 239.
 241 242 245. 249. 266 281
 318 321
 — posterior to Buddha, 222 305.
 — posterior to Alexander, - 221
 222
Pāṭhaṭha Sūtra, 61 272
Pāṭhavas, *Pāṭhus*, 39 98 114. 115.
 126 135 136 137 185. 186.
 286
pāṭhavya, 129 161
pāṭhōra 254 (Greek)
pāṭha, 161 (the four)
pāṭman dūra, 318
Pāṭhavya 3
Pāṭha, 188 220
Pāṭhaka, 66 142 143 318
Pāṭhāṭha, 143 305
Pāṭharāṭha, 305
Pāṭhāṭha, 143 305 (*Bhikṣu Su-*
tra)
 — (*Vyāsa*), 93 184. 185 240 243
Pāṭhāṭha, 243
Pāṭha, 284
Pāṭhāṭha, 34. 125 126 135
 136 186
Pāṭhaṭha, 136
Pāṭha, 288 292 293. 295

Pāṭhāṭha, 238
Pāṭha, 46 60 231 256.
pāṭha, 290 304 309
pāṭha 19 55
Pāṭhāṭha, 171
pāṭha, 303
pāṭhāṭha, 55
pāṭhāṭha, 141
pāṭhāṭha, 108. 198.
 — *Sūtra*, 84 245
pāṭha, 266
Pāṭhāṭha, 153. 159 160 164.
Pāṭha, edicts of, 6. 76 173 203.
 252 253 292 295
pāṭha 229 (Persian).
pāṭha, 111 112.
**pāṭha*, 71 131 285
Pāṭhāṭha, 265
Pāṭha (Ved.), 24 72 93 121
 122 124. 127 159 190
 — 190 191 195 206 207, 213
 215 282
pāṭha 76
pāṭha, 12 129
Purukūṭha, 68 125
puruṣa, 162 (the three p's, pur.).
 237 238.
 — *Nārāyaṇa*, 125 124.
 — *medha*, 54. 87 90 108 111
 — *śikṣa*, 65 108 155
puruṣāṭha 168
Purāṭha, 134
puruṣa, 150.
Purūṣa, 253 254. 255 257 258
Pushkara (1), 262
Pushpa Sūtra, 82. 84.
Pushyamitra, 224
pūṭha (filthy) 180
Purna, 98
Purūṣāṭha, 239 ff
Prithūdakaśāmin, 259 262
prāṭha, 67
prāṭha 319
Pāṭhāṭha, 171
Pāṭha, *Pāṭha*, *Pāṭha*, 14. 41
 46 56 81 90 130 134. 184.
Pāṭha, the, 46
Pāṭhāṭha, 259
**pāṭha*, 158 169
Pāṭhāṭha, 146 150 152 160
Pāṭha, 56 57 58
Pāṭhāṭha, 91
pāṭha 213
Pāṭha, 285
Pāṭhāṭha, 253 254. 258.
 259 260.

paṇḍita, 129
 Paṇḍitarasādhī, 102 285
 Paṇḍitakāvya, 268
 Paṇḍitapūjya, *pūjya, 240
 Paṇḍitacharya, 318
 prakṛti, 177 237
 prachalānam, 98
 Prājāpati, 76 97 137 151 244
 prajñapti, s. Surya, 297
 Prakaropaniṣad, 154 165
 Pratyāyā-Pariśiṣṭa, 102 106 115
 119
 Pratibhā 56
 pratibuddhi, 129 138
 Pratisiddhānta 214
 Pratyāśā-Sūtra 83
 Pratyāśā, 299 (Buddh.)
 pratyāśā, 49
 Pratyāśāyānāśā, 312
 prapadīśa, 61 64 65 66 76 79
 80 81 82 83 84 89 97 117
 145 151
 Prapadīśānāśā, 207 241
 Pramāgandha, 79
 pramāda, 28 244
 pramāda, 102
 pramāda 12 83 85 131
 pramādaśāstra, 101 240
 pramādaśāstra, 142 317 (Kāth.)
 pramādaśāstra, 108 119 139
 Pratyāśā, 71
 pratyāśā, 285
 pratyāśā, 281 305
 pratyāśā, 29
 Pratyāśāśāstra, 141
 pratyāśā, 80 100 101 102
 Pratyāśāśāstra, 58 158 ff
 Pratyāśāśāstra, 267 271 275
 prakṛti 177
 — prakṛti, 227
 Prācīya, 34 132 178
 Prācīya-Kāśya, 88
 — Prācīyāśā, 34
 Prācīyāśāśāstra, 154 162
 Prācīya, 123
 Prācīyāśāśāstra, 112
 Prācīyāśāśāstra, 23 26 59
 (Rig) 83 (Śāstra) 102 (Taitt)
 143 (Vājas) 151 (Ath.)
 Prācīyāśā, 56
 prācīyāśā, 28
 prācīyāśāśāstra, 84 118 139
 prācīyāśāśāstra 319
 Prati, 123
 Pratyāśāśāstra, 74
 Prācīyāśāśāstra, 53

prakṛti 115 134 136
 prakṛtiśāstra, 248
 Prakṛtiśāstra, 216
 Prakṛtiśāstra 83
 prakṛtiśāstra, 236
 *prakṛti, *prakṛti 196 198
 prakṛti, 12 124
 prakṛti, 56
 prakṛti, 131
 prakṛtiśāstra, 261 263 (echol.)
 prakṛtiśāstra, 192
 prakṛtiśāstra, 124
 prakṛtiśāstra, 8 66 86 89 121 122
 prakṛtiśāstra-Pariśiṣṭa, 62
 prakṛtiśāstra-Pariśiṣṭa 100
 prakṛti, 99 204 205 207 213 214
 232 319
 prakṛtiśāstra, 53 140 239 ff (phil)
 266 (med.)
 — (astr.), 260
 — Sūtra, 163
 prakṛti, 139-140 241 242
 prakṛtiśāstra, 10 34 (Ved) 267
 (erot.)
 prakṛtiśāstra 72
 prakṛtiśāstra, *Sūtra, 246
 prakṛtiśāstra, 91
 prakṛtiśāstra (e. vāda), 97
 prakṛtiśāstra, 190
 prakṛti, 51
 prakṛtiśāstra, 3
 prakṛtiśāstra 313
 prakṛtiśāstra, 269
 prakṛtiśāstra 33 96 132 178 218
 prakṛtiśāstra, 68
 prakṛtiśāstra, 214 232 319
 prakṛti, 42
 prakṛti, 133 134
 prakṛti (awakened, enlightened),
 27 167 241 284
 — prakṛti, 241
 prakṛti, 3 56 98 102 138 184
 199 200 217 ff 236 241 256
 273 283 ff
 — date of prakṛtiśāstra death, 217-
 220 287-288 302
 — posterior (N), or prior, to Pāṇini,
 3 222 305
 — lived in the Sūtra period, 290
 301 f.
 — wife of, 318
 — and prakṛti, 326
 prakṛtiśāstra, 218 273
 prakṛtiśāstra, 292 293 326
 prakṛtiśāstra, 267
 prakṛtiśāstra, 236

buddhopdaka, *Hid. 305
√budh, 27
 — with *prati*, 129
Budha, 278 282 (ur)
Bṛhadyātaka, 259 260.
 — *jāddā*, 163.
Bṛhat-Kāthā, 213
 — *Samhita*, 203 204 259 ff. 271
 274
Bṛhad-Atri, 269
 — *Śiṣya*, 269
 — *Aranyaka*, 70 71 72 73
 100 119 125 ff. 139 155 255
 286
 — *uttarārdra*, 169
 — *devatā*, 24 33 41 62 81 88
 314 316
 — *Yajñāralkya*, 281
Uṣhadratha, 97 98
brakant, 280.
Brahmā rādyavopaniṣad, 156 157
 166.
 — *Manu*, 279
Bṛhaspati, 153 (Atharvan)
 — *Smṛiti*, 278 280 (*laghū*) 326
Bujavṛpi, 266 (med.), & *Vaijya-
vapa*.
Bodha, 236
Bodhāyana, 322 323.
Bodhisattva, 298 301 307 310.
Bauddha, 108 158
Bauddhāyana, 100 101 102 111
 114 317 324.
 — *Dharma*, 101 102 278
Brahmagupta, 61 202 258 ff.
brahma-cāndra, 28 112 123 164.
 — *jāddā*, 163.
brahmāṅga, 166
Brahmadatta king, 138 286 (three).
 — 55 (comm.)
brahman, etymology of, 11
 — *dev*, prayer, formula, 11 149
 — — *Divine Power*, 6 127 101
 171 242
 — *man*, Supreme God 6 97 151
 158 161 166 167 170, together
 with *Viṣṇu* and *Rudra*, 97 161,
 with *Viṣṇu* and *Śiva*, 167 180.
 — — *chief priest*, 123 149
Brahma pura, 169
 — *bandhu*, 78 79 112 141
 — *śāntidant*, 240 241 ff.
 — *nd* 161
 — *ndyopaniṣad* 164.
 — *ndyopaniṣad*, 99 158 165
 — *veda*, 149 150

Brahmanavarta-Purāṇa, 191
 — *Siddhānta*, 258
 — *Sutra*, 70 96 241 ff. 308 322.
 — *katyā*, 125 126
Brahmānandī, 322 323.
Brahmapaniṣad, 160 ff.
brahma Spṛṣṭavāddhānta, 259
brāhmaṇa, *dev*, (appellative 'ex-
 planation,' 'section of a text'),
 76 93 117 124 152.
 — — *work*, 8 11-15 76 159 176
 239 240
 — *man*, 111 151 (nature of a Br.),
 176 (two languages), 180 (in
mlecchā), 276
 — *man*, 176
bhakti, 238
Bhagadatta, 188
Bhagavati Sutra, 297
Bhagavadgītā, 169 235 238 242
Bhāgavata, 121 153 (Atharvan),
 160 (Śāṅkara), 169 (mahādesh),
 284 (Buddha, &c.)
Bhagvatha, 193
Bhāgavati, 293.
Bhatta, 42 90 91 241, & *Bhā-
vata*.
Bhāṭṭa-śāstra, 207
Bhāṭṭa śāstra, 196
Bhāṭṭa Dikṣita, 89 226
Bhāṭṭapala, 242 243 258 299 ff.
Bhāṭṭa, *Bhāṭṭa*, 260.
Bhāṭṭabāṣya, 297
Bhāṭṭasena, 286
Bharata, son of *Dakṣa*, 11
 — *plur* 114 124
 — 231 (rhet) 272 (man)
Bhāṭṭasvāmī, 42 65 79
Bhāṭṭavāya, 71 162 163 (Upan.)
 — (Kāṣṭhāla), 263 268 (med.)
Bhāṭṭarajna, 141
Bhāṭṭaphara, 209 210
Bhalla, 95
Bhava, 178
Bhāṭṭa, 121 284
Bhāvabhūti, 159 200 205 206
 207 310
Bhāṭṭasvāmī, 42 79 91 101
Bhāṭṭasvāmī, 163.
Bhāṭṭavata, 238.
 — *Purāṇa*, 191
Bhāṭṭavāya, 130
Bhāṭṭa 62 246
Bhāṭṭasvāmī, 77
Bhāṭṭa, 322
Bhāṭṭa, 56 176 185.

- Bhāradvāja, 100-102 (Taitt) 139
 140 158 (Ath.) 271 (Drona)
Bhāradvāja-Sūtra, 100 317
 Bhāravi, 196 319
 Bhāruchi 323
Bhārundāsa śāstrī, 170.
 Bhārgava, 150. 153 159 (Vaidar
 bhi)
 Bhārgava, 250 (astrologer)
 Bhāllavius 14 62 81 95 134
 Bhāllaveya, 95 126 134.
Bhāllavyupaniṣad, 95 154 164.
Bhāṣā 57 103 144 176 177 180.
Bhāṣā-Sūtra 68 95
Bhāṣika 176
Bhāṣya 56 57 144. 176
 Bhāsa, Bhāsaka, 205
 Bhā-kara, 229 261 ff
 — mītra, 42 90 91 94. 101 103.
 171
Bhāṣyāraṇa, 261
 Bhāṣā 123 305
 Bhāṣāṣṭaka, 305
 Bhāṣāśāstra, -charya, 129 305
 Bhāṣā, -śāstrī, 284 285 305 306
 327
 — Sūtra, 143 352 305 306
 Bhāṣa, 259
 Bhāṣasena, 125 135.
 Bhāṣma, 39
 Bhāṣagana 98
 Bhāṣa, 227 263 314 317
 Bhāṣa, 53 153 241
 — plur 148 240 241
 — vāṣi, 94 154 156 157
 Bhāṣa, 265. 270 (med.)
 Bhāṣāṣṭaka, 305.
 Bhāṣāṣṭaka, 152
 Bhāṣāṣṭaka 42
 Bhāṣa, 195 202 (more than one)
 — king of Dhārā, 201 202. 203.
 21, 228 230 261 319.
 — 269 and
 — ruddhā 269 (med)
 Bhāṣāṣṭaka (reputed author of the
 Sarasvatīśāstra), 210.
 Bhāṣāprabandha 215
 Bhāṣāṣṭaka 226
 Bhāṣa, dolphin, 252.
 Bhāṣa, 127
 Bhāṣa, 70, 98 112. 147 269
 (weights) 286 287 290. 292
 295 296.
 — vāṣi, 112
 Bhāṣa, 148
 Bhāṣāṣṭaka, 80.
- Bhāṣa 248.
 Bhāṣa, 319
 Bhāṣāṣṭaka, 298
 Bhāṣa, 140
 Bhāṣāṣṭaka, 168
 Bhāṣa, 31 32 34. 43 64. 82.
 Bhāṣa, 49
 Bhāṣa, 95
 Bhāṣa, 169.
 Bhāṣa, 126 137 223
 Bhāṣāṣṭaka 75
 Bhāṣa, 128.
 Bhāṣāṣṭaka, 15 127 ff 138
 — Bhāṣaṣṭaka, 128
 Bhāṣa, 130
 Bhāṣāṣṭaka, 166
 — Sarasvatī, 267 271
 Bhāṣāṣṭaka, 167 169
 Bhāṣāṣṭaka, 102 106 115 133
 Bhāṣāṣṭaka 269 (Ath) 280
 — kanda, 118 119
 Bhāṣāṣṭaka, 89
 Bhāṣāṣṭaka, 157
 Bhāṣa, 264 Arabic
 Bhāṣaṣṭaka, 260 (also with a)
 Bhāṣa, 134. 211 (and the fish) 277
 (śāṣṭaka)
 — Code of, 20 73 102. 143 183
 188 238 244. 249 266 276 ff
 — Sūtra 99
 Bhāṣa 8 (= Veda) 176
 — rāṣi, 167 168
 Bhāṣa, 204 232 3-2
 (śāṣṭaka) Bhāṣa, 253 254. 260. 275
 Bhāṣa, 244.
 Bhāṣa, 188
 Bhāṣa, 40. 43
 Bhāṣa, 211
 Bhāṣāṣṭaka, 55
 Bhāṣa 206
 Bhāṣāṣṭaka, 195 209
 Bhāṣa, 75 76 83 84.
 Bhāṣāṣṭaka, 304.
 Bhāṣāṣṭaka, 209
 Bhāṣāṣṭaka (śāṣṭaka) Bhāṣa 47
 Bhāṣāṣṭaka, 163 185 (Bhāṣa)
 Bhāṣāṣṭaka 45 123. 169
 Bhāṣāṣṭaka, 100. 101 141 (comm.)
 262 (astr)
 Bhāṣāṣṭaka 238
 — deraṣi, 110 123
 Bhāṣāṣṭaka 302
 Bhāṣāṣṭaka, 293
 Bhāṣāṣṭaka, 154.
 Bhāṣāṣṭaka 326
 Bhāṣa-Bhāṣaṣṭaka, 74 138

Mahā Bhārata, 4 24 34 37 39
 45 56 57 72 98 114 135 136
 176 184-190 205 206 210 243
 250 279 282 301 318 324 325
Mahābhāṣya, 219-226 231 238
 321
Mahāmeru, 93
Mahāvāna Sūtra, 98 299
mahārāja, 138
Mahāvāna, 291 293
Mahāvākya-muktāvali, 155
mahāvaishṇava, 167
Mahāvīra, 296 (Jain)
Mahāśatrasaṅgīta, 207
Mahāvīraśāstra, 70 147
Mahāśāstrapūya Sūtra, 298 ff
Mahāśrūtīpāṭi, 248 (Buddh)
mahāśīla, 161
mahāśrīrāma, 217
Mahāśāstra, 48 70
mahāśīla, 114
Mahādhara, 104 107 ff., 116 141
Mahendra, 291 292 295
Mahāśara, 262 (astr)
Mahāopaniṣad, 154 166
Mahoraga, 302
Maṅgadhā, 79
 — *deśya*, 79 112 141
maṅgadhā, 111 112 138 147 237
maṅgadhā, 232 (riti)
 — *language*, 295 296 297
Maṅgā kārya, 196
Māndavya, 61
Māndūkāyana, 53
Māndūkī-Sūtra, 49 61
Māndūkeya, 49 56 112
Māndūkyopaniṣad, 161 164 167
 168 298
Matpiddita, 101
Mātrīmodaka, 144
matra, 160 (om) 161
Māthava, 134
Mādravati, 126
Mādri, 126
Mādhava, 41 42 47 116 235 241
 243 245 246 262
 — *deva*, 42
Mādhava, 95 166
Mādhukī, 133 134
mādhukī, 91
mādhyaṃdina, southern, 106
Mādhyaṃdina, 10 11 105 ff. 134
 139 144
Mādhyaṃdina, 105
Mādhyaṃdina, 106
Mādhyaṃika, 309

Mādhyaṃika, 224
Mānava, 134 (Sāryāta)
Mānava, *Mānavas*, 91 102 280 285
Mānava-Gṛhya, 20 101 278 311
Mānava-Dharmadharma, 20 277 ff
Mānasāra, 275
Mānutaṅtavyāsa, 134
Māya-mata, 275
māya, 284
Māyādevī, 284
Māra, 151 303 304
Mārkaṇḍeya-Purāṇa, 191 206
Mārkaṇḍeya, 207 320
Mālava, 201 214
Mālavakāśhārya, 259
Mālavika, *Mālavikāgnimitra*, 204
 207
mālaṃmantra, 167
Māhaka, 153
Māhātīthi, 134
Māhāśāstra, 103
Mudākhara, 107 281
Mānanda, 306
Mānada, 306
Māhara, 261
mānāśāstra, 102 240
Mānāśāstra, 121 159 235 239 ff
mānāśāstra *kyi*, 240
 — *Sūtra*, 140 239
mānāśāstra, 263 (Arabic)
mānāśāstra, 263 (Arabic)
Mukula, 322
mukta, 167 34 (apd *amukta*)
Muktaopaniṣad, 155
Mugdhāśāstra, 226
Muṣhāsānu, 55
Mutibha, 134
Mudimbha, 134
Mundakopaniṣad, 58 158 ff 240
Mundopaniṣad, 164
Muthāśāstra, 264 (Arabic)
Mudrāśāstra, 207
mura, 129
muntahā, 264 (Arabic)
mūlāśāstra, 151
Mūjavanta, 147
mudhābhāṣikā, 224 225
Māla-Sūtra, 297 (Jain)
musarīpha, 26 (Arabic)
Mūchhāśāstra, 200, 205 206 207
 250 305 320
Mūchhāśāstra, 167
Mūchhāśāstrānupaniṣad (?) 170
Mūchhāśāstrānupaniṣad, 170
Meghadūta, 198 204 208 209
 302

- Mētha, 319.
 Medhātithi, 52.
 Meru, 93.
 meśāraṇa, 255 (Greek)
 Mātra, 91 97
 Mātra Śāstra, 99
 Mātrāyāñītra, 71 98 285.
 Mātrāyāñīyā, 88 91 99 102.
 Mātrāyāñī Samhitā, 314. 317
 Mātrāyāñīnīśad, 52. 96 ff 153
 165 285.
 Mātreya, 97 98 99
 Mātreji, 56 99
 — Yājñavalkya's wife, 127.
 Mānāga, 93.
 māśā, 161
 Moggallāna, 230
 mūṇḍya, 237 306
 Munda, 150
 Maudgalya, 123
 Maudgalyāyana, 199
 mūḍa, 129
 mūḍā, 180
 Mākha, 98 273 302 303.
 Yā havarman, 217
 Yājñ-Samhitā, 9 10
 Yājñeda, 8. 45 85 ff 121 123
 127 164. 184.
 — dāmaṇya, 144
 Yājñ, 8 9 2 fukia.
 Yājñ varṇa number of the, 121
 Yājñatama, 68.
 Yājñoparita, 161
 Yājñ, 327 (dāmaṇya)
 Yājñatamadipikā, 322.
 Yājñvara, 323.
 Yama, 36
 — Smṛiti, 325.
 Yamaśāstra, 193.
 Yānyā, 264 (Arabic)
 Yamunā, 68
 Yavana, 178 187 188 214. 220 ff.
 251 252 253 260 (astr.) 268
 — priya 220
 — vṛddha, 243
 Yāyānī, 220 ff.
 Yāyānī, 207
 Yāyānī, 220 252
 Yāyānīyā, 258
 Yāyānīyā, 220.
 Yāyāgā ('), Yāyāgopī, 141
 Yāyānīyā, 111
 Yāyānī, 41
 Yājñā, 163.
 Yājñāyānīyā kīndā, 127 129 ff
 137 138
 Yājñāyānīyā bṛāhmarāṇa, 95 129
 130.
 Yājñavalkya, 33 104. 120 123
 124 126 127 128 129 130 131
 132 138 143 144 163 168 236
 237 ff 285
 — Code, 107 122 143 205 215
 250 278 280 ff 323 325 326
 Yājñā, 240
 Yājñāyānīyā, 141
 Yājñāyānīyānīśad, 93 94.
 Yājñāyānīyā, 121
 Yājñāyānīyā 309
 Yājñā, 260 (astr.) 324.
 Yādva, 3.
 Yādvaṇamuni, 323
 Yādva, 220
 Yādva, 25 26 32 33 39 41 42
 44 46 57 59 61 62 81 82 85
 88 90 91 128 140 142 176
 184 216 217 236 277
 Yājñā (the four), 70 113 151 159
 190 243 247 277
 — quinquennial, 113 277
 Yājñ Pūrṇa 214 251
 Yājñāyānīyā, 185 186 188 286
 — era 202 260
 Yājñ, 96 137 150 158 160 162
 163 165 166 235 236 ff 265
 285.
 — a. Sāmāyāyājñ
 — tātra, 165
 — Śāstra, 297 (Jain)
 — āhī, 165
 — Śūtra, 223 237
 Yājñāyānīyā, 309.
 Yājñā, 161 239
 Yājñā, 78
 Yājñā, 78
 Yājñāyānīyā, 195 196. 208 302
 318
 Rājñāyānīyā, 258
 Rājñāyānīyā (the nine), 200 228. 261
 Rājñāyānīyā, 319 322
 Rājñāyānīyā, 275
 Rājñāyānīyā, 227
 Rājñāyānīyā, 204. 320
 Rājñāyānīyā, 119 (Śāstra Br)
 Rājñāyānīyā, 199 287 295.
 Rājñāyānīyā, 213. 215 219 220.
 223 225 287 320.
 Rājñāyānīyā, 95
 Rājñāyānīyā, 54.
 Rājñāyānīyāyānīyā, 120.
 Rājñāyānīyā, 207
 Rājñāyānīyā, 53.

Rāṣyaṇiputra, 71 77 79
 Rāṣyaṇiyas, 65 79 84.
 Rāta, 61
 Rāma, 135 168 192
 — as incarn of Viṣṇu, 194.
 — Aupatāyina, 134.
 Rāmakaṣha, 85 143
 Rāmachandra, 59
 Rāmāḍāpantiyopaniṣad, 168
 Rāmatiritha, 323
 Rāmānuja, 168 322
 Rāmānanda, 168
 Rāmāyana, 4. 37 89 98 135 188
 191 ff 205 206 214 250 324.
 Rāmīla, 205
 Rāvapa (comm) 42. 66
 Rāvanabaddha, 196
 Rāhu, 73 249 250
 Rāhula, 250
 rīti (varieties of style), 232.
 Ruchidatta, 323
 Rudra, 6 40 97 110 123 159
 170 171 238 303
 — by the side of Brahman and
 Viṣṇu, 97 161
 — jābala, 163
 Rudraṣa, 322.
 Rudradatta, 101
 Rudraśakanda, 80 84. -
 Rudraśākhajābala, 163.
 Rūdropaniṣad, 154. 170
 rūpa (coin), 205
 Ruyyaka, 322
 Renukīkeṭa, 142
 sevati, 248
 Revā, 123.
 Romaka, 253 324.
 — pura, 253
 — suddhānta, 253 254. 258 260.
 romakupa, 253
 Raumyas, 253
 Rāhuniyana, 120
 *lakṣhaṇa, 265
 Lakṣmanānusa, 210.
 — era of, 210
 Lakṣmīdhara, 262 (astr) 323.
 Lagādāchārya, 61 249
 Lagata, *dha, 61 249 258
 laghu, 280
 — Atri, 269 (med.)
 — āryabhaṭa, 257
 — Kaumudī, 226
 — Jātaka, 78 260
 — Jābala, 163
 — Pārśvara, 280 (jur)
 — Brihaspati, 280 (jur)

— Saunala, 280 (jur)
 Lampka, 78
 Lahita Fustara, 199 236 256 286
 291 299 300
 Lāghula, 250.
 Lāṭa, 76 258
 Lāṭika, 76
 Lāṭi (rīti), 232
 Lāṭyāyana 53 68 76-79 84. 105.
 Lāḍāchārya, 61 258
 Lāḍakāyana, 53 241
 Lāṇakāyana, 53-77, 241
 — *ānna, 14. 99
 Lakhita, 326 (Smṛiti)
 Lāṅga Pārśva, 191
 Lachhavis, 276 277 285
 lapi, 221
 lāpā, 255 (Greek)
 Lāḍiati, 262 (astr)
 lēya, 254 (Greek)
 lēya (laukika), 246
 Lakaprabhā, 321
 Lokāyatas, 246
 Logdyata, 236
 lohita, 78
 Laukākṣha, 96
 Laukāyāṇika, 246
 Laukākṣhi, 99 102 103 139 317.
 — Sutra, 99
 Vaiṣṇava, 236
 vana, 41 71 120 127 128 129 ff
 184.
 — nartan, 113.
 — Brāhmaṇa, 42 74 75 79 84.
 Vajra, 260
 vajranakṣha, 167
 Vajrasūcīyopaniṣad, 162
 Vadhā, 56
 Vāta, 3
 Vada (i), 148
 vaktar, 180
 Vayavidyā, 265
 Varadatta 55
 Varadarāja, 76 83 (Ved) 226 (gr)
 Vararuchi, 200 202 230 (Vikrama),
 83 (Phulla-Sutra), 103 (Taitt.
 Prāt), 206 227 (Prākṛita-pra
 kṛa), 223 (vartt), 227 230 (lex.)
 Varāhamihira, 78 160 200. 202
 203 204 243 254. 259 ff 268
 275 279
 Varuna, 35 188
 varga, 31
 vāra, 18. 161
 — Sutra, 227
 varuṇa, 246

Vardhamāna, 226
 Varsa, 217
 Valabhi, 196 214. 256
 Valibandha, 198 207
 *vallī, 93. 157
 Valhika, 123 134
 Valhikas, 147
 Vāsa (Uśīnara), 45
 Vasiṣṭha, 31 37 53. 79. 123 162
 — *śuddhānta*, 258
 — *Smṛiti*, 326
 Vasugupta, 322
 Vāsua, 303
 vāṭkordīya, 121 122 127
 Vāṭyavādīya, 225 226
 Vāgbhaṭa, 269 (med.)
 — *śraddha*, 269
 vāṭh, 74. 176 234
 — (*śūddh*) 180
 Vāchaknavī, 56 129
 Vāchāpatimāra, 246 322
 vājā, 104.
 vājapāṇa, 54.
 Vājāsavasa, 157
 vājāsana, 104.
 Vājāsaneya, 104. 128 130 131
 Vājāsaneya, 100. 105 144.
 Vājāsaneya Samhitā, 317 (conclu-
 sion in the forty eighth Aṭṭ. Par)
 Vājāsaneyam 81 103
 vājā, 104.
 Vāṇch-śvara (!), 101
 vāṇa, 266.
 Vātsīputra, 71 138 285
 — *trīya, 138.
 Vātaya, 130 140. 267
 Vātsyāyana, 244 245 (phil.), 266
 267 (erol.), 323.
 — Pañchāpāra, 267
 Vādhēna (!), 100
 vāṇatrasṭha 23. 16.
 Vāmākakāśhāyana, 120.
 Vāmaśvara, 31 315
 Vāmana, 84 (Śāma) 226 227
 (gr) 232 (rhet.), 322
 Vāmanasthya, 140
 Vārāṇsi, 162 163
 vārāṇamantra, 163
 Vārūyupaniṣad, 94
 Vārkaṭi 33. 123.
 Vārkaṇas, 33.
 vārṭhika, 222. 225.
 Vārshaganya, 77
 Varsana, 133.
 Vārshnya, 133
 Vārshyāyana, 53.

vāṭkordīya vāṭas, 31, 32. 2
 Vāṭya 140
 Vālmiki 102 (Tant) 191 194.
 Vāṭkālā, 14 32. 52 56. 62 313 f.
 — *Smṛiti*, 52
 Vāṭkalopaniṣad, 52 155
 Vāsava, 303.
 Vāsaradattā 213 214.
 Vāṣṭha, 123.
 Vāṣṭha, 123
 Vāṣṭha Śāstra, 79 278 282
 (Dharma)
 Vāṣṭhā, 51 137 166 168 160
 185
 Vāṣṭhā 143 (comm.)
 vāṣṭhā, 185
 Vāṣṭhā 275
 vāṭhā, 8 84
 Vikrama, 200. 201 202. 204 205
 228 260 261 266. 269
 — era of 201 B. 260. 319
 — *charitra*, 200. 201 214. 267
 Vikramādīścharita, 214
 Vikramāditya, 200. 201 202. 205
 228
 Vikramārka, 214.
 Vichitravīrya, 39.
 vicāṇa 226
 vijāya, 140. 141
 Vijayanagara, 42.
 Vijayanandin, 238
 vijā, 141
 Vijānābhikāṣa, 237
 Vāṇa-Kaipo, 153.
 *vā, 121
 vāṇāṭhā, 33. 212
 Vāṇāṭhā 33. 129
 Vāṇā (!), 148
 Vāṇāṭhā, 134.
 Vāṇā (s. Kosala-Vāṇā), 10 33
 53 68. 123. 129 137 193-285.
 Vāṇāṭhāṭhāṇī, 207
 Vāṇā 121 122. 127 265. 270
 — (*tray*) 8. 45 121 191
 Vidyānagara, 42
 Vidyāraṇya, 42. 54 97 170.
 Vidyāmanorāṇī 323.
 vāṇā (Śāma), 74. 83 (five vāṇā)
 — (Ved.) 244.
 vāṇāṭhā, 33. s. Rūṇ, Śāma
 vāṇā 244.
 Vāṇā (Buddh) 199. 290. 292 304
 308. 326.
 Vāṇāyaka, 47 (comm), 62 (do)
 Vāṇāyaka, 51 99 283
 vāṇāṭhā, 226.

Sirupadabaddha, 196.
śīma, 114.
śīmadēvas, 303
śīu, 178.
Suka, son of Vyāsa, 184. 243
śukra (Venus), 98 250
 — *yayunshi*, 104.
śukriya, 104. 107 144.
 — *kānda*, 104.
śuklani yayunshi, 104. 131 144.
śungra, 33
śuduha, 167
śunskas, 33 34.
śunahśepa, 47 48 55
śumbha, 206
Sūtra-Sūtra, 101 236 274. 317
 324.
śuśna, 302
Sūdra, 18 77 111 112 276
Sudras, 147
Sūdraka, 205 206 207 214.
śunya (zero), 256
Śūlapāni, 166
Sesha, 101 (comm.) 237 (phil.)
Saityāyana, 53
Sailāli, 134 197
Sailūlana, 197.
śailūsha, 111 196 197
Saivabhaṣya 323
Saivādātra, 322.
Saisira, 33.
Saisiriya, 32 33.
Saungāyam, 75
Saichivriksha, 77 82
Saunaka (Rig), 24 32-34 49 54
 56 59 62 85 143
 — (*Āth*), 150 151 158 161 162
 165
 — (*Mahā-Bhārata*), 185
 — *Indrota*, 34. 125
 — *Svaiddāyana*, 34.
 — *Grhya*, 55 (*Rigv*)
 — *varita*, 158 162 (*Āth*).
 — *laghu*, 280 (*Smṛiti*)
Saunakiyas, 158 162.
Saunaktya, 151
Saunakopaniṣad (I), 164 165.
Saundhika, 198, & *saundhikas*
Saubbhreyas, 140.
Saulvdyana, 53
Syāparnas, 180.
śyena 78.
śīram, 27
śīramana, 27 129 138.
śīramasā, 305
Sri Ananta, 141

Śrīkantha Śivāchārya, 323
Sri Chāpa, 259
Śrīdatta, 141
Śrīdharadāsa, 210
Śrīdharasena, 196
Śrīnivāsa, 42
Śrīnivādāsa, 322 323
Śrī Dharmavābha, 196
Śrīpati, 54. 58
Śrīpārāṅkusanātha, 323.
Śrīmaddattopaniṣad, 164
Śrīvara, 320
Śrī Vyāghramukha, 259
Śrīshena, 258
Śrī Harsha, king 204. 207
 — 196 (*Naishadhachar*)
Śil Hala 145
śīru, 15
Śrutasena, 125 135
Śruti, 15 17 68 81 96 149 (plur.)
 159 164
śreshtha, 126.
Śānta Sūtras, 16 17 19 52
Reṣhma, 266
śloka, 24. 69 70 72 73 74. 83
 87 97 99 103 121 122. 123.
 125 127
Śvikas, 132.
Svetaketu, 51 71 123. 132 133
 137 267 (erōt.) 284.
Svetāśvatara, 96 99.
 — *ropaniṣad*, 96 155 156 161
 165 169 236 238
Shaṭchakropaniṣad, 168
Shaṭirīṇat (*Smṛiti*), 280.
Shadaśita (*Smṛiti*), 280
Shadgurusūbha, 33 61 62 83
Shaddarśanachintanikā, 322
Shaddhāshachandrikā, 217
Shadrasa Brāhmenn, 69 70
Shannavati (*Smṛiti*), 280
Shashitānta, 236
Shashitānta, 117 119
sam = *saṃvat* (but of what era?),
 141 202 203
samvat era, 182 202 203
Samvarta (*Smṛiti*), 278 326
Samvartatīrthyupaniṣad, 154 164
saṃskṛta, 192 (the sixteen s)
 — (gramm.), 144.
 — *ganapati*, 143
saṃskṛtābhāṣā, 177
saṃskṛt, 66 67
Samkṛitā (Ved.), 8 9. 10 14. 22-24
 3 60
 — (phil.), 75.

Saphid (astr.), 259 264 265 275
 — *Kalpa*, 153
 — *pāṭha*, 43 49.
 — *Upaṇishad*, 34 (*Brāhmaṇa*) 74.
 75 (*Sāma*) 93 155 (*Taitt.*) 316
 (*Sāma*)
Sakalīdhara, 275 (arch.)
samāhyat, 235
Samgītārāṇḍara, 273
samgraha, 119 (*Satapatha Brāh-*
mana) 227 (gramin)
saṃyadna 313 314.
Saffhāna 236
sātra, 66 76 79 80 139
sātrāgāra, 101
Sāya, 260 astr
Satyakāma, 71 130 132 134
Satyavāha 153
Satyakāśha, 100 101 102
Sadānirā, 134.
Saduktīlāraṇḍara 210
Saddharmapundarika 299 300
Sanatsumāra, 72 164, — 275 (ar-
 chit.)
Sanandanacharya, 237
sandhi, 23
saṃnipāta, 248 (Buddh.)
Saṃnyāsopaniṣad, 164.
Saptarishi (*Sirius*) 280
Saptasāhaka, *Saptasāti*, 83. 211
 237
Sapta sūryāḥ, 250 (249)
saṃdāna 4 131
Samdāna Samhita, 259.
saṃpradāya 152.
saṃrāj, 123.
Sarasvatī, 74 (*Vāch*)
 — *vyākaraṇa*, 227
Sarasvatī, 4 33 44 (*Indus*) 53
 67 80 102 120 134 141
 — *kanthadhāraṇa*, 210 232.
sarga, 190 196 214
sarjina, 233.
sarpa 302
sarpavidya 121
Sarporidya, 124 183 265 302.
Sarvadarśana-samgraha, 235 241
 322.
sarvamedha, 54.
Sarānukramanā, 61
sarānnina 305
Saropaniṣad, 162.
Salva, 120 132 180.
salama, 264 (*Arabic*)
Sāgala, 306.
Sāketa, 224 254

Sāṃkṛityāna, 266 (med)
Sāṃkhyā, 96 97 108 137 (*Satap*)
 158 160 165-167 235-239 242
 244 246 284 ff 306 308 309
 — *tattva-pradīpa*, 322.
 — *pratachana*, 237
 — *pratachana Sūtra*, 237 239
 — *bhūṣaṇa*, 78
 — *yoga*, 160 166 238 239
 — *sāra*, 237
 — *Sūtra*, 237 239 245
Sāṃkhyā (*Gautama*), 284
Sāṃkhyāyana, 47
Sāṃjiviputra, 131
Sāta, 75
Sātyayajna, 101, 133
Sātrājita, 125
Sāpya, 68
Samajataka, 300 (Buddh.)
Sāratantāra, 83
sāman, 8 9 64 66 121
 — number of the *sāman*, 121
Sāmayichārīka Sūtra, 19 278
Sāmalakshana, 83
Sāmasūtra, 72 74 277
Sāmarāda, 45 63 ff 121 316 325
 (*Gāna* of)
 — *Pratidhāya*, 316
Sāma-Samhita 9 10 32 63 ff 313
 (readings) 316.
Sāmas am, 275
Sāyākāyana, 96 120.
Sāyākāyana, 96
Sāyana, 32 41 42 43 46 47 48
 52 65 66 68 69 72 74 91 92
 94 101 139 150
Sāratthasamgala, 267 (med)
Sāmaṛya, 35
Sāratata 2.6 (gramm.)
Sāraṇa's pāṭha 103.
Sāvayasa, 133
Sāhityadarpana 231 321
Sāhāsanadāraṇḍara, 200-202 214.
 320
Siddhāna, 260 (astr)
Siddhanta, 253 255 258 ff 265
 (astr).
 — *kaumudī*, 89 226.
 — *śrōmanī* 261 262.
Sitā, 135 192 193
Sukanyā, 134.
Sukhavatī 306
Sūtoppiṭṭa, 293
sūtyā, 66 67
Sudāman 68
Sudyumna, 12c

- sunapīd*, 255 (Greek)
Sundarīdāpanīyopaniṣad, 171.
suparna, 314.
Suparṇadīpīyā, 171.
Suparṇi, 134.
Suprabhadra, 196.
Subandhu, 183 213 245 267 319.
Subhagasena, 251.
Subhadra, 114. 115 134.
Subhadehitaratnakara, 320.
Subhadehidraṭi, 320.
Sumanasantaka (†), 208.
Sumantu, 56 57 58 149.
sura, 98 302 303.
Surāshtra, 70.
Sulabha 56.
Sulabha, 56.
Suśrava, 35.
suśrī, 266.
Sūkruta, 266 ff 324.
 — *triddha*, 269.
śakta, 31 32 124 149.
śiṣa, 111.
Sūtra, 8 15 (etymol.; *chāndogāt*),
 29 56 57 216 235 290
 — 127 128 (passages in the *Brah-*
 ṛaṇas)
 — 290 231 296 298 ff. (Buddh.)
 — 128 161 (s = Brahman)
śitradhara, 198 275.
Sūrya, 62 (comm.)
Sūrya 40 (god)
 — *preyapā*, 297 (Jain.)
 — *Siddhānta*, 61 249 257 258.
 — *openishad*, 154. 170
 (*apīa*) *śūryā*, 250 (249)
Suryārura (*Sorū*), 280.
Sūryas 123. 132.
Setubandha, 196.
Sautava, 61.
Seindhavas, **vāyana* 147.
śobha, **nagaraka* 198.
Soma, 6 63 (god)
 — (sacrifice) 66. 107.
Somideva, 213. 319.
Somānanda, 322.
Somēvara, 273 (mus.)
Sanyāta, 28.
Sant, 34.
Sautrāntika, 309.
sautrānti, 107 108 113. 139.
saubhika, 198 & *śubhika*
Saunīpau, 134.
Saunilla, 204. 205.
Sauranddhānta 258.
śaulābhānī Brāhmaṇa, 56 95.
Sauśrava, 105.
Sauśrutapārthava, 266.
Skanda, 72.
 — *Purāṇa*, 191 205.
Skandasvāmī, 41 42 79.
Śāndopaniṣad, 171.
śakabha, *śabha*, 233.
śāpa, 274 307.
śāra, 67.
stoma, 67 81.
śtaubhika, 63.
śhāvra, 77 102 305.
śhānaka, 89.
Spandakāra, 322.
Sphujidhvaja (†), 258.
Sphuja-Siddhānta, 259.
Smaradhana, 208.
Smṛta-Sūtras, 17 19 34 (*Saun.*)
 101.
Smṛti, 17 19 20 81.
 — *Sāra*, 20 84. 143 276.
Srughna, 237.
Sparaparibhāṣā, 83.
śrddhāya, 8 93. 144.
śrddhānta, 309.
**śāra*, 79.
Svāyambhūva, 277.
Svādyāna, 34.
Śāndopaniṣad, 165.
Śānupaniṣad, 164. 165.
śāda, 264 Arabic.
Hanuman, 272.
Hanumanātaka, 203.
Haradatta, 89 278.
Hari, 166 (Vishnu) 303 (Indra).
Hari, 225 226 gram.
harya, 255 (Greek).
Harwanā, 34. 189.
Harischandra, 184.
Harisvāmī, 72 79 133.
Hariharavāra, 142.
Śrī Harsha (king), 204. 207.
 — 196 (*Nāṣadhāchar*)
 — *charita*, 205 214. 319 f.
Śrī Hala, 145.
śālābhṛt 192.
Hālyudha, 60 (metr.) 196 230
 (lex.).
hast, 112.
hastigata, 117.
Hāravarika, 88.
Hārīta (Kṛishṇa), 50.
 — 269 med.
 — *triddha*, 269 (med.)
 — (*Dharma*), 278 282. 325.
Hāla, 83 211 272.

- H. Nayas*, 140
H. Nānapura, 185.
H. Nāpadeśa, 212
Hibuka, 255 (Greek)
Himavanti, 51 268
Irma, 254 (Greek)
Hiranyakeśi, 100-102 317
 — *sikhiya-Brahmana*, 92
Hiranyanābha, 160
H. Kśātraka, 266
Hāna, 243
Hydrogen 254 (Greek)
Helid, 89
He' jās l-lasas, 180
Hemachin c. 227 321 (gr) 230
 (lex.) 297 (Jann.)
Helirja, 215
Hel, 254 (Greek)
Himavati, 71 156
Hiranyanābha, 125
Hulhila, 185
hetar, 14. 53 67 80 86 89 109.
 129 140
hord, 254 (Greek)
 — *Sdsra*, 254 259 260
hauraka, 101
Hrasva, 112

INDEX OF MATTERS, ETC

- Alyōkerus*, 254.
Ahriman (and *Māra*), 303 304.
Akbar, 283
Albirani, 60 189 201 239 249
 253 254 257-262 266 274 323
Alexander, 4 6 27 28 30 179
 221 222 251
Alexandria, 256 309
Alexandrinus (Paulus), 253.
Algebra, 256 259
Alkindi, 263
Amroghāra, 251
Amulet-prayers 208
Amyntas, 306
Anaśā, 255
Andubarus, 255
Animal fables, 70 211 ff., 301
Antigonos, 179 252.
Antiochus 179 252
Aphrodisius (?), 253.
Aphoditē 254
Arōkama, 255
Apollodotus 188
Apollonius of Tyana, 252.
Apoteletemata, 239
Araba *Arabian astronomy*, 255-
 257 263 264
 — *Araba astronomical terms*, 263-
 264
 — *commercial intercourse of the*
Indians with Arabia 220
 — *Arabian figures*, 250
Arabs — *medicine*, 266 270 271
 — *music*, 273
 — *philosophy* 239
Archimedes, 256.
Arenarius, 256
Arms, 254.
Arin, *Arin*, *coupo's d'*, 257
Aristoteles, 254.
Arithmetic, 256 259
Arjabahr, 255 259
Arkand, 259
Arrian 4 106 136
Arasodan Parthiana, 188
Arasand, 267
Azklepiads, *outh of the*, 268
Asyrovoula of the Indians, 30
Atoms, 244.
Aux, *auxis*, 257
Avesta, 6 36 145 (*Indian names of*
its parts), 302.
 — *and Buddhism*, 327
Avicenna, 271
Babirus, 211
Babylon, 2 247
Bactria, 207, a. *Valhika*,
Bagdad, 255 270
B. B., *island of*, 189 195 208
Bardesanes, 309
Barlaam, 307
Bashkar 262 263
Basileus, *Basili*, 306
Paulides, 309

- Lucilia, 251
 Lunar table, 211 ff 301
 Bulls, 307
 Lunar recessions, 194 205 208
 Nabataean, 232 294, 295
 Indian, 211
 Pleased, world of the, 50 (73)
 Rites, 309
 Rooting, 257
 Upr. Star, 28 30
 Punditism, Buddhists, 3 4. 20 22
 - 7 78 79 90 111 133 151 165
 205 229 235 247 276 277 280
 284 ff
 Buddhist notes, 281
 Buddhist, 247 252
 Clear, 183
 Cycles, 10 18 78 79 110 111 161
 1, 2 257 259 290 301 306
 Cylon, 192 282 291 293 295
 — medicine, 257
 Coelium, astronomy, 248 (L
 rustr)
 Chaos, 233
 Chers, 275
 Chinese lunar asterisms, 247 248
 (Kio Ls)
 — statements on the date of Ka
 naka, 287
 — to-day, 299 (Lunar) 291
 300 301 (Kaddi)
 — travellers, n. Fa Hien, Hsien
 Tsang
 Xenophanes (I xepōpōs), 255
 Christian influences, 71 189 238
 300 307
 — ritual, influence of Buddhist ri
 tual and worship on (and re
 versal), 307
 — to-day, Indian influence on, 237
 309
 Chronicon Paschale, 255
 Clements Alexandrinus, 306
 Corn, 205 (Ménaka), 219 (Ménaka)
 Coins, Indian, 215 218 219
 Commentaries, text secured by
 means of, 181
 Comparative mythology, 35, 36
 Constantine, 255
 Creation, 233, 234
 Great formulas, 166
 Curtius, 176
 Cycles quinquennial and sexennial
 113 247
 Darius, 252
 Darius, 175 ff
 Dara Shah, 283
 Day, beginning of the, at midnight
 254
 Decimal place value of the figure
 256
 Deeds of god, J. G. 271
 Degrees of the heavens, 255
 Demetrius, 251
 Deras, 255
 Dekhan, 4 6 192 283
 Dekhan recession (of the Urvati),
 208
 Demetrius, 35
 Demetrius, 233
 Demetrius, 229 304
 Dhauk, 179 295
 Diagrams, mystic, 310
 Dialects, 6 175 ff 205 296 299
 And, 271, 255
 D'Urs, 254
 Dismeter, 35
 Dion Chrysostom, 186 188
 Dionysius, 251
 D. 6, 255, 6
 Districts, divisions of Vedic schools
 according to, 65 94 130 133
 — of other texts, 193
 205-208
 — Varieties of style during 1-10
 by 11 m. 232
 Dolphin, emblem of the God of
 Love, 252 274 325 (Cupid and
 Venus)
 Aoropora, 255
 Aoropora, 229
 Dravidian words, 3
 Durgam, 289 291 302
 Dulva, 199
 Durimafusal, 272
 Durs, 255
 Egypt, commercial relations be
 tween India and, 3
 Elongation, 253-255
 Elements, the five, 234
 Embryo, 160
 Etruscan, 255
 Eras, Indian, 202 205 210 260
 Fa Hien, 218 300
 Father India, geographical names
 in, 178
 Ferdiand, 26
 Festival plays, religious, 197 198
 Figures, 256 374
 — expressed by words, 6 40
 Cindia, 37
 Firmicus Maternus, 254

Fortunatus, pursa of, 264-265
 Fox, in Fable, 211, 212
 Garmy, garms, 272 (mus.)
 Gange, 4 38
 — months of the, 193 248
 Galer, 307
 Garmy, 236
 Garmy, 233
 Girar, 179 295
 Goc. — m, 239 309
 Gobar figure, 256
 Gods, — ag s, et tues of, 273 — 14
 — lan rage of the, 176
 — trial of Agni Indra, and Su
 rya, 40 63 (A. I, and Soma) —
 Bishuran, Indra, and Vishnu,
 97 161 167 (Siva) 180 (Siva), 277
 Granta, 203 215 231
 Greek female slaves, 203 251, 252
 — monarchies of Paotia, 188 207
 215 221 251 285
 — words 254, 255
 Greeks Ch. k. Architecture, 274
 (three styles in India)
 — Astronomy, 153 243 240 251
 ff
 — Commerce with India, 252
 — Drama, 207
 — Fables 211
 — God of Love, 252 274 (f)
 — Influence upon India, 202 rally,
 251 ff
 — Medicine 263 324 325
 — Philosophy, 220 221 234
 — Sculpture, 273
 — Writing, 221
 Guido a Arzuo 274
 Gujarat, 139 170 207 251
 Gymnosophists, 27
 "Hades, 254
 Hades, 6 135 186 234
 Heraclius, 255
 Heretice, 98
 "Ephes, 254
 Homer, Indian, 126 188
 — Homeric cycle of legend 17,
 18, 254
 Opus, 255
 Hindustan, 4. 6 10 10 38 39 70
 187 192 283 296
 Huan Thsang, 217 ff 287 300
 Humour, the three, 266
 Hinduism, 36
 Tiroch, 254
 Tiroch, 28 48
 "Tiroch, 255.

Ibn Abi Usab ah, 266
 Ibn Ba thar, 265
 "Ish, 254
 Immigration of the Aryas into Hin
 dustan 38 39
 Indo-Scythians 220 285
 Indus 10 37 38 218 285
 Inher. and I. —, 278 279
 Initial letters of names employed
 to denote number, 256 to mark
 the seven mu rai no es, 272.
 Inscription, 185, 215 225
 Intercary month, 2, f 262 (three
 in the year)
 Invisible cap, 264.
 Jackal and lion in Fable 211,
 212
 Java, island of, 109 195 298 229
 171 280
 Jehan, 283
 Jehangir 283
 Jem hid 30
 Josephat, 307
 "Jebel, 3 177
 Kafu (tapi) 3
 Kadyur, 291 294 326
 Kadam, 317
 Kankav, 36
 Kai Khe ru, 36
 Kaling and Damrag 320.
 Kallia wa Dima 212
 Kalmuk translation 291
 Karmas, 88 268.
 Karmas, 178
 Karmas, 178
 Kandras translation, 189
 Kanerki, s. Kaniska.
 Kanerki, 292
 Kankah, 209
 Kapur di Giri, 179, s. Kapardigiri.
 Kashmir 204. 213 215 220 223.
 227 232 231 296.
 Kava U, 36
 Kavi language, origin of name,
 195
 — translations, 318 (date of) 325
 Kespis, secret of doctrines, 49.
 Keshik, 255
 Keshik, 254 255
 Keshik, 3
 Keshik 35
 Far pd, 302
 Kio-lu, 248
 Kio-lu, 254.
 Fwph, 3.
 Kio-lu, 254.

- Εράνο, 254.
 Ασική, 76 258
 Idē, 249 258
 League boots, 264.
 Αίωρ, 254
 Ασική 255
 Lion and jackal (fox), 211, 212
 Longest day, length of the, 247
 Love, God of, 252 274
 Lunar mansions, 2 30 90 92 148
 229 246-249 252 255 281
 304
 — places, 281
 Μαδιαρίσος, 10 106
 Μίγας, 170 252
 Magic, art of, 264, 265
 Magic mirror, 264
 — ointment, 264
 Mahmūd of Ghazna, 252
 Mairya (and Māraf), 303
 Μαλλοί, 222
 Manes, 309
 Manes, sacrifice to the, 55 93 100
 108 118
 Manetho, 260
 Mansions, twelve, 254 281 (astr.)
 Manuscript, late date of, 181 182
 (oldest)
 Μάσσαγας, 75
 Mazzaloth, Mazzaroth, 248
 Medicine in Ceylon, 267, in India,
 324 325
 Megasthenes, 4. 6 10 20 27 48
 70 88 106 136 137 186 234
 251
 Meherdates, 188
 Menander, 224 251 306
 Menāni, 223 (in Soghd).
 Merdicancy, religious, 237
 Μεσσηνία, 255
 Metempsychosis, 234.
 Metrical form of literature, 182
 183
 Missionaries, Buddhist, 290 307
 309
 — Christian, 307.
 Μήνη, ἀπὸ μηνῶν, 20
 Monachism, system of, 307
 Monasteries, 274 281
 Mongolian translations, 291
 Mundane ages (four), 247, s. Yuga
 Music, modern Indian, 325
 Musical scale, 272
 Μὴ τέρας, 197 198
 Mythology, Comparative, 35 36
 Names chronology from, 29 53
 71 120 239 284 285 (s. also
 Aḡa, Kavi, Tan'v, Eutra)
 Nearchoa, 15
 Neo-Pythagoreans, 256, 257
 Nepō, 291 300, 310
 Nepōse MSS, date of, 318
 Nererga, 56
 North of India, priority of language
 in the, 26 45 296
 Notes, the seven musical, 160 272
 Numbers, denoting or, by the
 letters of the alphabet in their
 order, 222.
 Numerical notation by means of
 letters, 257 324.
 — Symbols, 256
 Νόβη-άν, 212
 Owens, 69 152 264
 Ophir, 3
 Oral tradition, 12 ff. 22 48
 Ordeal, 73
 Orissa, 179 274.
 Otbi, 201
 Οὐρανός, 35
 'Οὐρανός, 252 (s. Arin)
 Οὐδύδκας, 222
 Pahlav, 188
 Pahlavi, translation of Pāliśatantra
 into, 212 267
 Pāli redaction of the Amaraśaśa,
 230
 — of Manu's Code, 279
 Παρδά, 136 137 186
 Παρδά, 2. 3 4 88 207 248 251
 309
 Pantheism, 242
 Παρθένας, 254.
 Parthians 4. 188 318
 Parvi, parvīz 323
 Pattalene, 285
 Paulus Alexandrinus, 253 255
 — al Yūndol, 253
 Peacocks, exportation of, to Eféren,
 2, 3
 Periphus, 4. 6
 Permutations, 256
 Perna-Aryana, 6 133 148, 173
 Persians, 3 4. 188, — 273 (mus.).
 274 (arch.)
 Persian Epics, 36 37 187
 — translation of the Upanishads,
 155
 — Veda, 36 148
 Personal deity, 165, 166
 Περικλῆς, 268
 — 1018, 255

Philosopher's Rock, 291
 Philos. ratu., 252
 Ptolemaeus, 273 (type of)
 Phoenicians, their commercial relations with India, 2, 3 248
 Photoloulo 218
 Phoenia, 218
 Planets, 98 153 242-251 252-255 281 304-
 — Greek order of the, 319 323 326
 Pl to (Bactrian Lang), 273
 Pliny, 136
 Plutarch, 306
 Polar star 93
 Popular dialects, 6 175-180
Plutarch, 28. 24,
 Pro. & writing asserted in its development, 183.
 Ptolemaeus, 253 274 (tr)
 Ptolemy, 179 251 252 (tr)
 — 130 (Geogr)
 Quintus nual cycle, 113 247
 Quotations, text as given in, 182 219
 Retic-worship 306 307
 Rgya Cber Rel Pa, 185 291
 Rhazes, 271
 Rock inscriptions, 179
 Ro ary, 307
 Sardis, 217 223
 Sap, 28
 Scale, musical, 272
 Schools, great number of Veda, 142
 Seleucus, 4.
 Semitic origin of Indian writing, 15
 — of the Benat-fable, 211, 212
 Serapion, 271
 Seven musical notes, 160 272
 Sinabend, 255 259
 Sinhalese translations, 292
 Socrates 254.
 Sordani 309
 Sura, 302
 Solar year, 245, 247
 Solomon's time, trade with India in, 3
 Soma, 251
 Soma, 253
 Squaring of the circle, 256
 Stepha., 274 306
 Stone building 274.

Strabo, 6 27 28 30 31, 246
 Style, variety of, distinguished by
 names of province, 232
 Succession of existence, 239 301
 Sûfi philosophy, 239
 Sivas, 215
 Sun a two journeys, stellar limits of
 the 98
 Supercary, 76
 Surgery, 260 270
 Tandjur, 209 210 225 237 245
 267 276
 Tappo, 254
 Teachers, many, quoted, 50 77
 Texts, uncertainty of the, 181, 182
 224, 225
 Thousand name-prayer, 203
 Tibetans, translations of the, 201
 212 231 294 300 & D. Ogilby,
 Kôvur, Kya Cher Pal Pa
 Tandjur
 Tiradite, 3 4
 Toldin, 254
 Transcribe a, mistakes of, 181
 Translated, a. Arab, Chinese,
 Kalmuck, Karesse Kavi, Mon
 gelian, Pahlavi, Pali, Persian,
 Sindiale
 Transmigration of soul 73 283
 Tropy, 255
 Tryon cycle or legend 194
 Tuumim, peacocks, 3
 Valentinian, 500
 Venus with Jupiter (and Cupid)
 325
 Vernaculars, 175-180 203
 Veterinary medicine, 267
 Vesta, 160 259
 Writing 10 13 15, — of the Ya
 vanas, 221
 — consignment to, 22 144. 181
 272. 295
 Writer, 189 190, 193 &c.
 Yeshts, 56 30—
 Yima, 30
 Yezast, Yezast, Dui atf, 307
 Zoro 256
 Zeus, 35.
 — planet 254
 Zoroastrian, 98, 229 249 254
 255 257
 Zoro, 30
 Zoro, 254.

INDEX OF AUTHORS.

- Ambros, 272
 Anandachandra, 58 68 79
 Anquetil du Perron, 52 96 151,
 155 162
 Aufrecht, 16 32 43 59 80 84
 112 150 191 200 210 211 224
 226 230 232 243 257 260
 261 267 272 313 315
 Bâstlein, 223 226 237 322,
 323
 Baillet-Latour, 223 226 235 237 244
 Banerjee, 191 235 238 243
 Bânu Deva Sâstru, 258 262
 Bartl, 257 316 321
 Bartholmey St Hilare, 235
 Bayley, 304
 Beal, 293 300 309 327
 Benary, F., 196
 Benfey, 15 22 43 44 64 66 117
 157 212 225 267 272 274
 303 306 320
 Bentley, 257 267
 Berggren, 44
 Bernoulli, 325
 Bertrand, 202
 Bhagvânâ Indraj, 324
 Bhagvân Vijaya, 327
 Bhagvânkar, 60 150 215 219 224
 319 321 326
 Bhân Dâj, 215 227 254-262 319
 Bibliotheca Indica, a. B. Hentyne,
 Banerjee, Correll, H. H., Raj-nâra
 L. M., Boer, &c
 Birkell, 320
 Biot, 247, 248
 Bird, 215
 Bohlingk, 22 106 210 217-220
 222 226 230 310 323
 Von Bohlen, 272
 Bollensen, 44
 Bopp, 178 189
 Boyd, 207
 Brôl 4 36
 Brockhaus, 213 262
 Brown, 84
 Buhler, 50 54 92 97 101 157
 155 164 170 182 196 201 210
 212, 213, 214, 215 217 222
 227 232 257 259 272 277,
 278 280 282, 283 297 31,
 315 317 319-322 324-326
 Burges, Lb., 247 258, 322, 215
 Burnell, 3 13 15 20 22 42 61
 65 69 74 83 90 91 94 101
 102 103 150 155 163, 164 170,
 171 178 203 213 215 217 221,
 222 226 245 256 270 313 316
 321
 Burnouf, 81 111 162 179 191
 199 246 259 291, 292 296 298
 300 306 308
 Cantor, 324
 Cappeller, 226 232 320
 Carey, 194
 Chandralata Tarkakara, 81
 Child, 178 293 295 305 308 326
 Clarae, Comte de, 325
 Clough, 293
 Colebrooke, 42 43 61 97 145
 151 154, 157, 158 163 201
 202 227 229 230 234 235
 236 238 241, 242 243 245 256
 259-263 267 269 281 283
 Coomara Simmy, 293
 Cowell, 42 43 50 52 91 97 98
 99 207 227 234 235 237, 238
 242 256 283 291 322
 Cox, 36
 Coorna Korom, 199 209 267 285
 291 294
 Cunningham, 178 203 215 271 274
 D'Almeida, 293
 Darmesteter, J., 314
 Davids, 267
 De Gubernatis, 36
 Delbruck, 31 44 318
 Gerard de Lualle, 3
 Dhanapati Sinha, 327
 Dickson, 326
 Dietz, 267
 Donner, 19 44
 Dawson, 141 203 215
 Dumsichen, 3
 Duncker, 308
 D'Eckstein, 97
 Eggeling, 203 215 226 291
 Elliot H. M., 239 297
 Elliot, W., 154, 155
 Fauche, 189 191
 Lausbell, 293 324 326
 Feer, 180 291 293 297
 Ferguson, 203 215 275
 Fleet, 319 321
 Flûgel, 270

- Olahausen, 4. 188 318.
 Patterson, 273
 Pavie, 189
 Peitsch, 40, 60
 St. Petersburg Dictionary, 16 104.
 108 112 141 250 305
 Pischel, 206-263 227 295 320 321
 Polay, 50 139
 Pons, Père 216 254
 Pramadi Dāsa Mitra, 231
 Premachandra Tarkavāḍṛṣṭi, 232
 Pinesop, 179 229
 Prym, 320
 Rājāśānta Deva, 275
 Rājāśāntaśāstrin 223.
 Rājendra Lāla Mitra, 48 61 65
 73-84 94 142 151 155 158 162-
 104 166, 167 169-171, 182 202.
 210 215 220 271 274-275 297
 299 315 317
 Rāmamaya Tarkaratna, 158 168
 Rāmamāśāstrin, 322
 Rāmanārāyaṇa, 58 91 243.
 Rām Rāṣ, 275
 Raak, 293
 Regnaud, 318 320
 Regnier, 34-59
 Reinand, 61 148 201 202 217
 219 229 239 252, 253 256-
 259 262, 263 266 269 274 307
 Penan, 309
 Pier, 230
 Roer, 43 48 51 54 73 74-91
 94-96 116 139 154-157 160
 161 231 235 244-262.
 Rosen, 43
 Post, 66 182 191 236 268 270 279
 Roth, 8 22 23 25 33 36 33 41
 43 44 48 63 70 80 102 112
 146 147 150 152 178 201
 247 267, 268 270 303
 Royle, 271
 S.-chau, 253 323.
 Satyavrata Sāmāsrin, 66 297 316
 Schiefner, 56 185 209 212 227
 248 291 300 306 307 326
 Schlagintweit F., 310
 Schlegel, A. W. v. d., 194 231 275
 Sch'uter, 234
 Schmidt 289 291 305
 Schomborn, 48
 Schwantack, 20
 Sedillot, 247
 Senart, 293 301 326.
 Shyalar Pandit, 204 315 318
 Sourindra Mohan Tagore, 325
 Speiser, 19 102 142
 Spriegel, 293 300 306
 Steinschneider, 247
 Stenzler, 34 55 58 142 195 206
 263 277-280 318 325
 Stevenson, 43 65 215 297 326
 Storek, 293
 Strachey, 262
 Streiter, 55
 Tārāśāha Tarkavāḍṛṣṭi, 57 184.
 226
 Taylor, J., 262
 Taylor, W., 155 162 164, 165
 167 169-171
 Thibaut, 60 256 316 324
 Thomas, 215 256
 Tournour, 267 292, 293 306
 Vaux, 215 273
 Vechanarāmāśāstrin, 190 323
 Vinson, 3
 Viśvanāthaśāstrin, 60
 Vullers, 268
 Wagener, A., 211
 Warren, 297
 Wassiljew, 248 300 309
 Weigle, 189
 West, A. A., 215
 West, P., 278
 West, L. W., 215.
 Westergaard, 22 184- 201 203.
 215 223 250 264 283 293
 295 304.
 Wheeler, T., 190 251 281
 Whish, 254.
 Whitney, 2 23 64 103 150 152
 247 257, 258
 Wilkins, 228
 Wilkinson, 262.
 Williams, 189
 Wilson, H. H., 43 148 179 189
 191 204-207 213 215 221
 230 236, 237 250 268 270
 271 281 285 305 306 318
 Wilson, J., 215
 Windisch, 297
 Windischmann, 73 243
 W. d. o., 270
 Woepeke, 253 256 257
 Wright, Dan., 318
 Zimmer, 34